D
000 592 569 8
UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

277.c.

3 vols.
1 3 101



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

ETYMOLOGICON UNIVERSALE;

OR,

UNIVERSAL
ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY:

ON A NEW PLAN.

IN WHICH IT IS SHEWN,
THAT CONSONANTS ARE ALONE TO BE REGARDED
IN DISCOVERING THE AFFINITIES OF WORDS,

AND

THAT THE VOWELS ARE TO BE WHOLLY REJECTED;
THAT LANGUAGES CONTAIN THE SAME FUNDAMENTAL IDEA;
AND THAT THEY ARE DERIVED FROM

THE EARTH,

AND THE

OPERATIONS, ACCIDENTS, AND PROPERTIES,
BELONGING TO IT.

WITH

ILLUSTRATIONS DRAWN FROM VARIOUS LANGUAGES:

The TEUTONIC DIALECTS, *English, Gothic, Saxon, German, Danish, &c. &c.—Greek, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish.——The* CELTIC DIALECTS, *Galic, Irish, Welsh, Bretagne, &c. &c.——The* DIALECTS *of the* SCLAVONIC, *Russian, &c. &c.——The* EASTERN LANGUAGES, *Hebrew, Arabic, Persian, Sanscrit, Gipsey, Coptic, &c. &c.*

VOLUME I.

CAMBRIDGE:

PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS:
FOR RICHARD PRIESTLEY, 143, HIGH HOLBORN, LONDON.

1822.

SOLD FROM
A. F. ETHERIDGE
LIBRARIAN.
LINCOLN'S INN LIBRARY

*P
321
W62
v.1

PREFACE.

In my former Work on the subject of Etymology, I unfolded the doctrine of *Elementary Language*; and I illustrated by a series of examples, how that doctrine might be applied to the discovery of relations, existing between Words, which were before totally unknown. In explaining this *Elementary Doctrine*, it was shewn, that Consonants were alone concerned in preserving and exhibiting the affinities of words, and that the Vowels were to be wholly removed from our regard, and even rejected from our view. By the establishment of this doctrine I had laid the foundation of a new System in the developement of Human Speech; and every thing was indeed then discovered, which related to the symbolical forms, by which the affinities of Language are propagated and preserved. I was then fully persuaded, that the Earth was an important object in supplying the *First* and *Fundamental idea*, conveyed by words; and I had accordingly announced, that my succeeding Work would probably be dedicated to the consideration of those words, which were connected with our term Earth, and its numerous parallels, existing in various Languages. Though I was always persuaded of the importance of this object in supplying the *Fundamental idea*, deposited in words; I did not imagine, that the connection with this object was always to be discovered, or always to be exhibited. I conceived, that we might well be contented with our success in unfolding the secrets of Language, if we were enabled to discover the relation of a series

929178

of words to each other, under some general or prevailing notion; and I imagined, that the *Original* and *Fundamental idea* could only be occasionally seen, or partially detected. I had certainly never hoped, that I should be enabled to pursue this principle in so wide a sphere of action; through which, as I now conceive, it is capable of being extended. I had certainly never ventured to suppose, that I should be enabled at once to assume this *Fundamental idea*, this secret master-spring in the mechanism of Language, as the first principle of my System, to which I could readily refer all the other parts of the same machine, however remote and dissimilar they might appear.

The present Work, where the words are examined, which belong to our term EARTH, is established on this principle, and other Volumes are already prepared, which relate to Races of Words under different Elementary characters, and which are constructed on the same foundation. I must request therefore, that the present Volumes may be considered as representing the first part of my Work on the subject of Etymology; and that the former Volume should be regarded only as an illustration of the *Elementary Doctrine*, on which alone the Art of Etymology is founded; as it relates to the symbolical forms, by which the relations of Language are generated and recorded. I have stated in a portion of this Volume, that my former Work was arranged with due care and diligence; and that the affinities of the words, which were there examined, have been detailed with fidelity, according to the true principle of the *Elementary Doctrine*. But however successfully those words may have been explained, under one point of view, as relating to each other in their secondary though prevailing idea; the Reader will at once understand, that this mode would not correspond with the new and more extensive plan, on which the present Volume has been prepared. The various parts therefore of the former Work will appear in some future Volume,

when

when the Elementary Character, to which they belong, shall be considered; and the Race of words, which it contains, will again be detailed under the relations before explained, with an exposition likewise of the *Fundamental idea,* by which that Race is connected with other Races of words, conveying a different sense, under the same Element.—The Title of my Work has been changed from ETYMOLOGICON MAGNUM to ETYMOLOGICON UNIVERSALE, that the pale of distinction between the two publications may be more marked and decided. To each of these *Titles* some objections may be formed; but as in deliberations of this kind there is no end, and but little profit, we may rest satisfied with a brief appellation, which sufficiently designates the nature and the extent of the performance.

The *Introduction* of the former Work has been enlarged into an ample *Preliminary Dissertation,* in which an abundance of new matter will be found, of great and extensive importance, in the contemplation of Languages. In this Dissertation I have considered the *Elementary Doctrine* more fully; and I have here exhibited a Canon, relating to this Theory, (page 25,) and unfolding to us a wide scene in the affinities of Human Speech, which were before altogether remote, and totally unknown. I have added likewise a series of observations, which are intended to illustrate the additional part of my System, contained in these Volumes; and I have shewn, in a brief detail of acknowledged and familiar examples, the potent operation of the EARTH, in affording various trains of ideas, which appear to be altogether remote from the nature of such an origin. I have moreover distinctly though briefly unfolded the various *Elementary Characters,* (p. 94, &c.) which supply names for the EARTH, &c., and which will become the objects of my enquiry in future Volumes on the origin of Languages. Though no explanation can be more concise than this detail, on a subject of such vast extent, it must not however

however be considered as superficial; and brief as it may appear, it will save perhaps to the enquirers into Language whole years—I might venture to say,—even ages of misapplied and unsuccessful meditation, on this involved and mysterious question. The Writer may certainly be permitted to make this declaration, when he freely unfolds the painful operations of his own mind on the same enquiry, and confesses, that years of ardent and incessant meditation on this subject have passed away, before he was enabled to form the last results; which are there stated, brief as they are in the narrative, and easy as they may appear in the discovery.

If my Readers should perchance enquire, with some emotions of kindness or curiosity, when the future Volumes of this Work are destined to appear; it may be necessary perhaps to observe, that with *them* only this secret is deposited, and that the Writer's visible and public operations will be prompted solely by *their* zeal in the study of Languages, and the pursuits of Etymology.—By strong and unequivocal testimonies of that zeal much may be performed; and I have little doubt, that from this influence the same ardor in the same cause will be communicated to those, who are usually considered as the most important and indispensable agents in the productions of Literature.—Under the propitious auspices of such agents, the Writer may continue to instruct the present age in the Art of Etymology; and he will not fail to join with his coadjutors in applauding the good taste of an enlightened and a liberal Public.

On the appearance of future Volumes, and the probability of future success, time only will decide; but in the publication of the present Work, the Writer has enjoyed a patronage, which he is grateful to acknowledge, and proud to commemorate. By the Syndics of the Cambridge Press I have been relieved from a portion of the burden,

burden, which was attendant on the first Part of this Volume, in their grant for printing its contents; and I shall ever, I trust, retain a just sense of the benefit, which such a Patronage has conferred upon my Work.—Though the Writer has by this event obtained a prize in the Lottery of Literature, he is not wholly exempt from the imputation of that species of indiscretion, which is attached to those, who engage in such adventurous concerns. The Work has materially increased beyond its intended magnitude, from various causes, which could not be foreseen, or could not be prevented; and the Writer has from hence exposed himself to evils, which perhaps at some future time these kind and considerate Patrons of Literature will be pleased either to remedy or to remove. We however, who are the objects of this honourable patronage, must be at least assured, that all, which can be justly asked, will be liberally dispensed; and that the bounty of our benefactors is restrained only by the limits of their resources and the number of their clients.—Before I relinquish the theme of gratitude, I must record with the most lively emotions the zeal of an inestimable Friend, at once ardent and intelligent in the cause of Letters, who has perpetually watched over the progress of these Volumes, and who has never failed to cheer the Writer, amidst the perils of publication, with the most appropriate and efficient consolation.

It has been justly observed, that to perform for the last time any actions, not attended by misery or by guilt, is painful and affecting. Such I feel to be the probable issue of that task, in which I am now engaged; and perhaps the Reader is at this moment perusing the last address, in which I shall ever solicit his attention to a work on Etymology.—To aspire to the martyrdom of Letters, under all its forms and with all its consequences, would be at once a folly and a crime;

and

and the Student may well be contented with the ordinary privations and disabilities, to which the cultivation of Literature has too commonly condemned its victim, even in the prosecution of its own purposes. But whatever may be the prevailing current of Public taste, or Public curiosity; I may perhaps be permitted to declare, that the fate of Etymology is not finally deposited in opinions and decisions like these. As the Writer is not to be corrupted by the possession of Public favour; so his ardor in the search of truth is not to be extinguished by their rejection, or diminished by their neglect. I shall still continue, in the recesses of my solitude, to meditate, to collect, and to record; and I shall readily resort to that last, though too often delusive topic of consolation, which is so familiar to my unfortunate brethren in the same cause,—that a future age will perhaps receive with complacency, or even with applause, what the present age may disregard or despise.

WALTER WHITER.

Hardingham-Parsonage,
Norfolk,
May 15, 1811.

PRELIMINARY DISSERTATION.

SECTION I.

(1.)

The writer details the train of ideas, passing in his own mind, by which he was conducted to the adoption of his Theory.—The imperfect state of the Art of Etymology.—Nothing to be performed in this Art, unless the Principles of it can be generalised.—Attempt of the writer to discover some *Abstract* or *Universal Principle*.—The most familiar Terms at once present to his view the strongest examples of *Uniformity*, from which might be expected the adoption of some *General Principle*, when duly arranged and understood.—This *Uniformity* consists in the existence of the *same Consonants*; that is, Consonants of the *same power*; or, as they are called by Grammarians, *Cognate Consonants*, which still remain attached to the *same* words, or to the *same* or *similar* ideas, however various in form those words may appear.—The *Vowels* afford no *Principle* of *Uniformity*, or afford no Laws.—In tracing therefore the Affinity of words to each other, conveying the same or similar ideas, the Etymologist must consider only the existence of the *Cognate Consonants*, and totally disregard the *Vowels*.

THE WRITER, who assumes the province of unfolding a new train of ideas, will find various and important difficulties to encounter in the prosecution of his design. It has been perpetually observed, that our minds receive with suspicion and reluctance any new modes of investigating a subject, with which we were before familiar, and of which, as we might imagine, the genuine principles had been already discovered, discussed and established. Even the simplicity of a doctrine may serve to increase the difficulties of the task; as we are unwilling to be persuaded, that an idea so obvious and natural could have eluded

the ordinary exertions of our own sagacity. The writer will likewise feel considerable embarrassment in adjusting the due form, which is most adapted to impress the Reader with the force of his Theory. To diffuse what is plain and simple would be to labour in the cause of obscurity; yet the novelty of the subject may perhaps demand a more detailed and ample discussion, though the principle itself should be obvious and perspicuous. As the author will probably explain with more effect, when he unfolds the genuine feelings of his own mind; I shall endeavour to lead the understanding of the Reader through the same train of ideas, which originally conducted me to the adoption of my Theory. The offensive Pronoun, which accompanies the narrative, may perhaps be pardoned; when the purpose, for which it is employed, shall be candidly considered. The detail will be simple—without disguise and without ornament.

I had ever lamented, as others likewise have perpetually done, the imperfection of that Art, which professes to unfold the *Origin of Words*; and I had long been convinced, that nothing could be effectually performed in the advancement of this subject, till a new arrangement was adopted, totally dissimilar to the former. In devising this *new* arrangement, I instantly perceived, that the artifice to be employed (whatever it might be) would not consist in discovering a *new* Principle, which in a subject like this has no meaning; but in applying to *new* purposes, and in a *new* manner, a Principle derived from a *known—ascertained* and *acknowledged fact*, which was visible on every occasion. Nay, it was on this very circumstance alone—of applying a fact so well *known* and *acknowledged*, that my hopes of succeeding in a *new System* were founded. The reasoning on this occasion was short and conclusive. From a fact thus palpable—familiar and universally operating, I inferred the *Uniformity* of a *Principle*; and I had learned from the Academic studies of my youthful days, (which are still deeply impressed upon my mind,) that to *Uniformity* belonged *Laws*; and that *Laws* supplied a *Theory* and a *System*. I cannot be supposed to mean, that the *Laws*, which I might conceive to operate on this occasion, would be similar to those, which are subject to the investigation of Mathematical Symbols;

Symbols; but it is easy to understand, that *Laws* of some kind or other would necessarily exist, which might afford a train of reasoning equally strong and convincing, as that, which is employed in the deductions of Mathematics.

Among the Etymologists, no idea of submitting a race of words to a *general law* had ever been adopted. One word was supposed to be derived from another *single* word; nor was there any attempt to discover an *abstract* or *Universal Principle*, to which these various separate instances might be referred, and by which they might all be connected with each other. The present state of Etymology I compared with the imperfect art of Arithmetic, which is conversant only with particular cases; and I imagined, that the new mode of *generalizing* the doctrine of Language, (if any such could be adopted,) might be compared with the science of Algebra. When I reflected on the recent discovery of this simple artifice, by which such wonders are performed; I received fresh confidence, that the *Art of Etymology* might be advanced by the application of a Principle equally known—plain and familiar; and I was taught to consider the discovery or adoption of a *new System*, which in these days might be attached to the *Art of Etymology*, equally probable and natural, as the invention of Algebra, which, within these few years, has been added to the art of Arithmetic. Without enquiring into the Algebraic artifices adopted by the ancients, or the cultivation of this science among the Arabs, and the discoveries of *Tartalea, Vieta, Des Cartes*, &c. we know, that *Newton* invented or advanced the Binomial Theorem; and we may well imagine the state of this science before the adoption of so important and extensive an operation. The doctrine of Fluxions is founded on another artifice, attached to the Algebraical notation; and thus almost within the limits of the present age have arisen two Sciences, which have brought under our grasp the remotest objects in the system of the Universe.

But the simplicity of the first Principles, on which Algebra is founded, afforded likewise the hope and the prospect, that the adoption of *Principles equally simple*, applied to another subject, might produce consequences equally wonderful and extensive. The *datum*,

on which Algebra has been established, is simply this, that *Equals added to—subtracted from—divided or multiplied by—equals, are still equal to each other.* On this principle *alone* is the doctrine of Algebra founded: The rest is nothing but the adoption of a new and concise language expressing this fact; and in all the various changes and operations of the Equation, with which its wonders are performed, this principle and this *only* is applied. The ordinary Mathematician, who has confounded others and himself, by attaching to the calculations of Algebra the idea of something mysterious or profound, will be astonished perhaps to understand, that in the highest exertion of his faculties—in the most perplexing moments of his deepest cogitation, it was his duty only to remember and apply this simple principle; and that all his Involutions—Evolutions—Substitutions, &c. &c. were employed for the sole purpose of profiting by this single maxim; and of bringing his various operations within the sphere of its action.

Having seen, that in the forming of any system it was necessary to adopt a *known* and *acknowledged* Principle—*universally* prevailing, I began to consider, 1st, What *great—general fact* existed; and 2d, Whether it could be applied to any purposes in the adoption of a new theory. I sought for information in those words, which were most familiarly employed; as it is manifest, that if any *Uniformity* was observed in words so perpetually liable to change from frequent use, I had the strongest evidence for concluding, that such an *Uniformity* was generally prevailing. FATHER, in English, I perceived to be FÆDER in Saxon—VATER in German—PADRE in Italian and Spanish—FADER in Islandic and Danish—VADER in Belgic—PATER in Latin and PATEER, (Πατηρ,) in Greek: in other cases of the Greek *Pateer*, we have PATER and PATR, (Πατερ-ος—Πατρ-ος,) and if the changes of the word were to be represented, as it is sounded in different dialects of the kingdom, it might be written *Feethir—Fauthir*, and in various other ways. In Persian, *Father* is PADER; and in Sanscrit, PETREE, as I find it represented by Mr. Wilkins in his Notes to the Heetopades, (Page 307.) A more striking *Uniformity*, we shall instantly acknowledge, cannot well be imagined than that, which is exhibited

exhibited in the preceding terms. We here perceive, though the word FATHER has assumed these various forms, that the difference arises only from the change of the vowels themselves or of their place; but that the *Same Consonants*, or those which all Grammarians, at all times, have acknowledged to be *Cognate*, have still been preserved.

In our earliest stages of acquiring knowledge, we learn, that "Inter se *Cognatæ* sunt, Π, B, Φ—K, Γ, X—Τ, Δ, Θ,"—P, B, F—K, G, C*h*—T, D, T*h*: and that these letters are called *Cognate*, because they are changed into each other in the variations of the same word. Without embarrassing the Reader or myself in this place by defining the *identity* of a word, I shall appeal only to the ordinary conceptions, which every one has admitted on this subject. All would allow, that *Father*, *Fæder*, *Vater*, *Padre*, *Fader*, *Vader*, *Pater*, *Pateer*, *Pater*, *Patr*, *Feethir*, *Fauthir*, *Petree*, are the *same* words, or different forms of the *same* word. Now as Vowels, *not* the *same*, or *not* in the *same* place, are here adopted; the *sameness*, (if I may so express it,) of the word does not consist in the vowels, or rather, the Vowels have nothing to do in determining the *sameness* or *identity* of a word. We observe however, that the *same idea* is expressed by the *same Consonants*, or by those, which Grammarians have considered as *Cognate* or of the *same kind*. Now the words *Pater* and *Father*, &c. have various senses all related to each other,—signifying 1st. The *affinity* of nature; 2d. The *author* or *producer* of any thing; 3d. The *founder* of a sect, &c. Thus we perceive, that in denominating words to be the *same*, we mean those words, which are represented by *Consonants* of the *same kind*, impregnated with the *same train of ideas*.

Here then we obtain at once a species of *Uniformity*, which leads us directly to the hopes of forming a *regular System*. Even this instance alone would be sufficiently impressive to convince us, that some controuling Principle predominated in Languages, by which they might readily be submitted to the Laws of a general Theory. Words, uttered by the passing breath, we have ever been accustomed to consider as the most fleeting—changeable—inconstant and capri-

cious

cious of all the objects, with which man is conversant: Yet we perceive, that a Word most liable to change and perversion, has remained invariably the *same* through a period of nearly three thousand years; if we consider only the existence of this word from the time of Homer, without involving ourselves with the remote periods of the Sanscrit Language. This instance, I must again repeat, would be alone sufficient to convince us, that *Uniformity* of some sort perpetually prevailed; and the same fact we shall accordingly find in *all* the instances, which every Etymological writer will afford us, who has collected the *same words*, as they appear in different Languages.

Thus *Mother* becomes in Greek *Meeteer*, (Μητηρ,)—in Latin *Mater*—in Saxon *Mothor*, *Meder*, *Medder*—in German *Muater*, *Muoter*, *Muder*—in Spanish and Italian *Madre*—in Danish *Moder*—in Dutch *Moeder*; as I find these words represented in Junius and Skinner. In the modern German the word is written *Mutter*—in the Persian it is *Mader*, as Mr. Richardson has expressed it—in Sanscrit it is *Matree*, as it is written by Mr. Wilkins; and in Greek it again appears under the forms of *Mateer*, (Ματηρ, Doric,)—*Meeter*, *Meetr*, (Μητερος, Μητρος.) Again, *Brother* becomes *Frater* in Latin; and I shall add the article in Junius, who produces the parallel words existing in various languages: "Goth. *Brothar*. A. S. *Brother*, *Bre-* "*ther*, *Brothor*, *Brothur*. Al. *Bruoder*, *Bruother*, *Bruder*, *Pruader*. "Cym. *Brawd*. Cim. *Broder*. D. *Broder*. B. *Broeder*. Sclav. *Bratr*." In the Persian it is *Burauder*—in the Galic *Brathair*—in the Irish *Bratair*. Our word *Brother* becomes *Brethren*; and the Welsh *Brawd*, which Junius has produced, becomes *Frodyr* in the plural, as we find it in the Welsh translation of 'Dearly beloved *Brethren*.' Again, under *Daughter*, Junius represents the parallel terms in other Languages after the following manner: "Goth. *Dauhtar*. A. S. *Dohter*, "*Dohtor*, *Dohtur*. Al. *Dohter*, *Tohter*, *Thohter*. Cim. *Dotter*. D. "*Daatter*. B. *Dochter*;" and he then observes, "Inter tot diversas "scribendi rationes nulla est, quæ non aliquod præ se ferat vestigium "G. Θυγατηρ, Filia." We perceive, that all these may not only be traced to the Greek *Thugateer*, but we may observe that a greater *Uniformity* and resemblance cannot well be conceived. The *Same*

Cognate

Cognate Consonants are preserved; and we may understand from our word DAUGHTER, how the changes have arrived. In DAUGHTER we have a record of the G in THUGTER or THUGATEER; though in sound, the G has disappeared, and the word might have been represented by *Dauhter*, as in the Gothic *Dauhtar*, &c. Nothing can be more obvious than the cause of these different forms; which arise, we perceive, from the guttural sound of the G becoming faint and obscure. In modern German this word is written *Tochter*, and in Persian, a *Daughter* is *Dokht* and *Dokhter*, as I find the words represented by Mr. Richardson. I shall not load my page with an accumulation of unnecessary examples, as the Reader may be well assured, that a similar fact will be found to exist in every instance, where the *same Word* (as it is universally called) passes through various Languages, or appears in different dialects and stages of the same Language.

Surely the contemplation of these *Facts* will impress on every mind a similar train of ideas; and the Reader has already anticipated my reasoning and my conclusion on this subject. He will be struck with the deepest astonishment, that *Facts* like these, perpetually passing before the eyes of the Etymologist, should never have suggested the *Principles* of a *Theory*, and the *Laws* of a *System*. Among objects liable to the influence of chance and change, it is not possible to conceive a species of *Uniformity* so full and impressive, as that model of regularity which is here exhibited: The varieties of mutation are bounded by limits of controul, almost incompatible with the vicissitudes of change; and nothing but a *fact* so striking and unequivocal would have persuaded us to believe, that such constancy could have existed in a case, where disorder and irregularity might be imagined alone to predominate. These words, after having passed through millions of mouths, in remote ages and distant regions of the world, under every variety of appearance and symbol, still continue, we perceive, to be represented by the *same* Consonants—not indeed by Consonants bearing the *same name*; for that perpetually varies with the form of the symbol, but by those *Consonants*, which Grammarians have always considered to be of the *same kind*, and invested

invested with the *same power*. In considering the various *Vowels* attached to these Words, we at once perceive, that they supply *no* Principle of *Uniformity*, and therefore are unable to furnish any *Laws*, by which the Words can be recognised to be related to each other. On the contrary, they tend rather to obscure and disguise this affinity, since if no Vowels at all existed, as symbols in the representation of the above terms, the relation of these words would be still more apparent. Thus FTR, FDR, VTR, VDR, PDR, PTR, would manifestly represent to us the affinity of those Words, which we commonly express under the more disguising forms of *Father*, *Fæder*, &c.; and the same may be observed of the representations MTR, MDR, for *Mother*, *Meeteer*, (Μητηρ,) &c.—BRT, BRD, PRD, FRD, for *Brother*, *Brether*, &c. If the Vowels, which are adopted in expressing these words, were *alone* used, all *affinity* would be lost. Thus if *Father*, &c. or FTR, &c. were expressed by *ae*, *æe*, *aee*, *a*, *eei*, *aui*, *eee*; *Mother*, MTR, &c. by *oe*, *eeee*, *ae*, *oo*, *ee*, *uae*, *uoe*, *ue*, *oee*, *aee*, *eee*, *ee*; and *Brother*, or BRT, &c. by *oe*, *oa*, *ee*, *oo*, *ou*, *uoe*, *ue*, *uae*, *aw*, *oee*, *a*, *uaue*, *aai*, *ee*, *oy*, we at once perceive, that every *Principle* of Distinctive Affinity would be obliterated, and written Language would altogether become one entire blank, without any traces of ideas or meaning.

Thus, then, we at once recognise, manifestly and unequivocally, a *Principle* of *Uniformity*, by which we are at once supplied with the most important maxim in discovering the origin of words. In these enquiries, the *Consonants only* are to be considered as the representatives of Words, and the *Vowel Breathings* are to be totally disregarded. It is necessary, before we advance forward in our discussion, that this maxim should be precisely understood. The *Principle*, which I am labouring to establish, may be thus more minutely unfolded.—If the Etymologist is desirous of tracing out the same word, as it is called—*Brother*, *Father*, &c. through different Languages, or amidst various modes of writing and pronouncing that word in different periods or dialects of the same Language—or, if he is desirous of discovering, what words, conveying similar ideas, are derived from each other—belong to each other, or are successively propagated from each other;

other; he must seek this affinity or relationship among words possessing the *same Cognate Consonants*; and to this test only it is his duty perpetually to appeal. He must totally disregard all difference of appearance in the words, whose affinity he examines; as that difference arises from the adoption of different Vowels in different places; or as that difference arises from Consonants bearing a different form, and called by a different name. He must regard only the existence of the *same Cognate Consonants*—of *Consonants* invested with the *same power*—*Consonants* of the *same kind*, which he has seen—known and acknowledged in the most familiar instances to be perpetually changing into each other, in expressing the *same* or *similar* ideas. He should acquire the habit of viewing words in their *Abstract*—*Simple* state, as belonging only to these *Cognate Consonants*, and freed from those incumbrances, by which their difference of appearance is produced, and under which disguise their mutual affinity to each other has been concealed from his view.

It surely cannot be necessary to suggest to the Reader, what I have in fact already so distinctly urged, that the rejection of the Vowels, as useless and unnecessary, refers *only* to the *Art of the Etymologist*, and to the purposes, for which that Art is applied. We all know, that in the *speaking* of a Language the Vowels assume their full share of importance, and that the Consonants are even indebted for their existence to the friendly offices performed by the Vowels. I have purposely omitted among the examples above produced, two parallel terms for *Father* and *Mother*, as the French *Pere* and *Mere*, where the second Consonant of the Radical has been lost. It must be observed, that Languages are often liable to such accidents; yet it generally happens, as in this case, that sufficient evidence still remains for the purpose of determining the origin from which the words are derived. No one doubts, that the terms *Pere* and *Mere* belong to the series of Words, expressing the same meaning, which I have before detailed; as the sense, which these terms bear, and the Consonants, which still remain, are fully sufficient to preserve and to attest their affinity. The evidence of Identity is not at all disturbed by this accident, nor is our dependence on the permanency of Conso-

nants, as the records of affinity, at all diminished. On the contrary, these solitary instances of deviation will afford an example of that peculiar force, attached to an *exception*, by which, as we are told, a *Rule* is at once confirmed and illustrated.

(2.)

The Writer endeavours to explain fully and precisely his Hypothesis, as it relates to the means of recognising the Affinity of Words by their symbols.—The object of the Art of Etymology, and the materials of which it is formed.—The Alphabet arranged, as it relates to the purposes of the Etymologist.—The *Cognate Consonants* minutely detailed.—The inflexions of Verbs and Nouns, in Latin and Greek, examined.—The changes of certain *Consonants* in modern Languages.—Every evidence tends to confirm and establish the former assertion, as an Etymological Axiom, by which alone the purposes of an *Art* are performed, that the *Cognate Consonants*, under the same or similar ideas, decide on the Affinity of Words, and that the Vowels are to be totally rejected.

I HAVE now possessed my Reader with a full view of one part of my Hypothesis, from conclusions, which have been drawn from the most familiar examples. It is necessary however, that we should proceed with great care and caution in laying the foundation of our Theory; and it is incumbent on the Writer to detail more minutely, and under various points of view, the nature of the evidence, on which that Theory has been formed. It is necessary for us to be impressed with the most distinct conception respecting the object, which the Etymologist endeavours to attain by the exercise of his Art; and we must then endeavour to ascertain and to arrange with all possible precision, the qualities or properties of those *materials*, by which the purposes of his Art can be effected. It should seem as if the race of Etymologists had passed their lives without endeavouring to decide in their own minds, or even to enquire, what was the object of their research, and what were the principles, on which it should be conducted

That

That is, our Etymologists have never thought it necessary to define, or even to investigate what constitutes the nature of the affinity between the terms, belonging to each other: These terms they attempt to discover, under the sole guidance of some obscure and undefined impression, not altogether abhorrent from the truth. Thus, for example; if any Etymologist had ever enquired of himself the precise grounds and reasons, on which he was authorised to assert, that the terms, which he had collected as parallel to *Father*, were in truth related to each other; he must have been led to see and to acknowledge, that he supposed them to belong to each other, because they conveyed the same or similar ideas, and were represented by the same Cognate Consonants; and he must have acknowledged moreover, that the existence of the Vowels gave him no assistance in forming this opinion respecting their affinity. If, I say, any Etymologist, at any time, had thus communed with himself, and had enquired even in a single instance, into the state of his own mind, on the affinity of those words, which he was perpetually producing as parallel, under the influence of an obscure and undefined conception; he must at once have been conducted to the Axiom, that the *Cognate Consonants*, conveying the same or similar ideas, *alone* decided on the affinity of Words and that the Vowels availed nothing. Under this Axiom alone, the researches of the Etymologist assume the functions and perform the purposes of an *Art*. All, which has been at present effected, is confined within the narrowest limits, without any vestiges of a Principle or a System. The most profound and acute of our Etymologists is excluded from the province and the praise of an Artist. Even in the happiest exertions of his labour or his skill, he can claim only the merit of an industrious collector, who is not wholly destitute of some obscure and indistinct impressions, connected with the nature of his duty, which lead him to the discovery of a *few* parallel terms directly attached to each other, and presenting themselves to his view, under some undefined traits of affinity and resemblance.

The principles of our Theory may be thus more amply and distinctly unfolded. It will be granted, I imagine, that it is the business

of

of the Etymologist to discover those Words, which belong to or are related to each other. Now words cannot belong to each other, unless, by some process of change, they have passed into each other. If words pass into each other, they must carry with them the train of ideas, which they convey; and thus, in words related to each other, the same fundamental idea must exist, either in an apparent or a latent state. The fundamental idea, in a series of words related to each other, may be latent or obscure, amidst the various senses, which those Words represent; for the same reason, as the fundamental idea in the *same* word in the same Language may be obscure amidst the different senses, which that word conveys. Still however we all agree, that the different senses of any Word, however numerous they may be, and however remote some of them may appear from each other, must have been formed from the same fundamental notion, whatever may have been the process, by which those senses have been propagated. Thus, then, in discovering the Affinity of Words, it is necessary to shew, that they appear under forms, which by the familiar operations of Language, may have passed into each other, and that they contain the same fundamental idea.

It will be agreed, that it would be the vainest and idlest of all pursuits to enquire about the Affinity of certain Words to each other, which is to be ascertained by shewing, that the forms, under which they appear, have passed into each other; if in considering the familiar changes of Language it should be found, that *all* Words pass into each other without any recording marks of difference or distinction, by which one set or class of Words can be separated or distinguished from another. Hence it follows, that the component parts of Words, that is, the Letters, by the changes of which into each other, the various forms of Words are produced, must be of such a nature, as to supply these marks of distinction. That is, it is necessary, that *certain Letters* should so regularly and familiarly pass into each other, to the exclusion of the rest, that the Words, in which such Letters are found, thus familiarly passing into or Commutable with each other, may be justly said to belong to each other, as distinguished from other Words, attached to other sets and classes of Letters. It is

the

the duty therefore of the Etymologist to discover such *Letters*, which by thus regularly and familiarly passing into each other, to the exclusion of the rest, will afford those marks of record and distinction, by which the Affinity of Words is ascertained. If any Letters should be found, which pass into each other, without supplying any such records of Affinity; these should be rejected as useless and impeding to the purposes of the Etymologist, however important those Letters may be, in fulfilling other purposes. Such Letters, which by passing into each other create difference of forms, without supplying any distinctive records of the affinity of those forms, must impede and embarrass the Art of the Etymologist; whose duty it is to discover the *Affinity* of forms, amidst all the disguises of difference and variety.

In the examples above produced we have seen, that the *Consonants* of the same power, or the *Cognate Consonants* by remaining attached to the *same* idea, to the exclusion of other Consonants do preserve this distinctive affinity; and that the Vowels, by passing into each other promiscuously, afford no marks of affinity whatever, but on the contrary tend to obscure that affinity, by increasing the variety of forms. Thus, then, as I before observed, in the representation of the above terms, for the purposes of Etymology, I would entirely reject the *Vowels*; and I should say, that *Father* would be best represented by some mode like the following; FTR, PTR, VTR, VDR, &c. or F, P, V}D, T}R—*Mother* by MTR, MDR, &c. or M}D, T}R and *Daughter* by DGTR, TCTR, TTR, &c. or D, T, &c.}G, C, T, &c.}R. This representation will fully answer my purpose, till we have defined with precision the nature and number of these Cognate Consonants; and we at once see, how, by this simple mode of generalising the subject, the mist begins to vanish from our eyes, which had before darkened all our views, and clouded all our conceptions on the nature of Languages. It is not possible to express the progress, which we have made in the Art of Etymology by this simple artifice of wholly rejecting the *Vowels*. We might almost say, that every cause of difficulty, as it relates to the foundation of a System, is obviated, when this Axiom of totally disregarding the Vowels is brought into effect, by removing them altogether out of our sight. Having advanced

vanced so far in certain instances, we shall be enabled to make a rapid progress in our ideas of generalization. These words, we see, are what Etymologists have called the *Same* words, as being words conveying the *Same* notion, and appearing under Consonants of the *Same* power. But it is the business of the Etymologist, we know, not only to discover the *Same* words in various Languages, that is, the Words directly Parallel conveying the *Same* sense, which have passed into each other, but those likewise, which in passing into each other have assumed different senses. Now it will be at once acknowledged, that these terms thus passing into each other, though conveying perhaps senses very different and apparently very remote from each other, must be attended by the same accidents, which are observed to take place under the familiar operations of Language in similar cases of words passing into each other. That is, the *Cognate* Consonants will continue to be attached to Words, related to each other, by the process of passing into each other, whether those Words contain the same sense, or different senses. In all cases therefore the existence of the *Same Cognate Consonants* must still be regarded as the record, by which the Affinity of Words is to be recognised; if it can be shewn, that amidst their diversities of meaning they do in fact contain the *Same fundamental idea.*

As it is from the observation of *Facts* alone that we can deduce these principles, and not from any abstract reasoning on the nature of the Consonants and the Vowels; we must not depend on the evidence of the few examples given above, but we must convince ourselves by a survey of other examples, that the same process of Language is universal; that is, that the Cognate Consonants remain attached to Words, as the record of their affinity, and that the Vowels afford no record whatever. The Writer feels an embarrassment in deciding on the mode, by which he should exhibit this truth, as founded on the evidence of *Facts*, to the mind and the eye of the Reader in an introductory Dissertation; when the whole Work is destined to illustrate the same truth by a series of similar Facts. All that can be done must consist only in producing a few Facts, or in pointing out the mode of observing such Facts, or in detailing some general information on the subject,

subject, which may be sufficient to support the writer in laying the foundation of his System. I shall first arrange the Alphabet according to a mode, useful, as I conceive, to the *Etymologist*; and I shall then illustrate the nature of the *Cognate* Consonants, according to that arrangement. When this is performed, I must request the Reader to take into his hands any book of Etymology, as Skinner, Junius, &c. in which the acknowledged parallel terms are recorded; and he will find, after the most superficial view of a single half hour, employed in the enquiry, that the general current of examples, which pass before him, exhibit similar *Facts* to those, which the above examples have displayed, and authorise conclusions, which are supposed in my Hypothesis.

We may divide the Consonants into three classes, after the following manner: 1. M, B, F, P, V. 2. C, D, G, J, K, Q, S, T, X, Z. 3. L, N, R. The Letters in the first Class have been called *Labials*; and we shall find, that they *familiarly* pass into each other, to the exclusion of the rest. The Letters in the second Class have been variously arranged, under different names; but however useful these divisions may be for some purposes, they are totally repugnant to the purposes of the *Etymologist*, as we shall find, that the Letters in the second Class pass *familiarly* into each other, to the exclusion of the rest. The Letters L, N, R, are placed in a Class, not as being similar to each other, but as being distinct from each other, and as having laws peculiar to themselves; as will be more particularly explained on a future occasion. It is not to be understood, that these Classes are not sometimes connected; as we shall find, that *all* the Consonants, under certain circumstances and by certain processes, have passed into each other, as the Etymologists have abundantly shewn. We shall find, however, that in the ordinary operations of Language the distinctions are faithfully preserved, and that no confusion arises from this partial connection of the classes. It is sufficient for the purposes of distinction, or of preserving and recording the distinctive Affinities of Words, that certain Consonants *regularly* and *familiarly* pass into each other, to the exclusion of the rest. The partial connection of these Classes with each other, like the exceptions of a Rule, serves rather

rather to confirm and illustrate the general principle of distinction. It must be observed, moreover, that the mode, in which these Classes are connected, is conducted by laws of Uniformity, affording marks of distinction, not less defined than those, which belong to the more general analogies.

The Grammarians have told us, that those Consonants are *Cognate*, which are *Changed* into or are *Commutable* with each other, in the inflexions of *Nouns* and *Verbs*. These instances are well chosen, as the different *Declensions* and *Conjugations* of Nouns and Verbs represent to us the Laws, by which large and distinct classes of words are varied in the familiar operations of a Language. We must observe too, that the changes of the Consonants in the *same* word, in certain cases and tenses, will shew to us the mode, by which the mind is accustomed to proceed with Consonants, when it is desirous to represent by their means the *same* idea, under some variation. It is easy to understand, that the mind must be swayed by the influence of a similar impression, so as to adopt a similar artifice, when it endeavours to propagate variety of meaning, under the *same* fundamental idea, in the production of the *same Race* of Words; that is, of a Race of Words directly passing into each, and connected with each other. The Grammarians have done well, I say, in delivering the Definition, which they give us of the Cognate Consonants; as connected with the examples, to which they have appealed, but they have strangely and most grossly erred in detailing those Cognate Consonants; as the facts exhibited in their examples are repugnant to their arrangement. The Vowels P, B, F, (Π, Β, Φ,) as they tell us, are *Cognate* Consonants, and L, M, N, R, are *Immutable*, because they have no corresponding Letters, into which they may be changed in the inflexions of Nouns and Verbs, "Liquidæ vel *Immutabiles* αμεταβολα, Λ, M, N, P.— "Quia non literas Antistoichas vel *Cognatas*, quibus ipsæ mutentur in "Verborum et Nominum inflexionibus habent."

Our Grammarians might have learnt from their own examples, that *M* should be added as a *Cognate* Letter to P, B, F; and that these Consonants are *changed* into each in different tenses of the same verb, or in representing the same idea under different circumstances.

Thus

Thus the action of *Beating* is expressed in Greek by Tup, Tuf, and Tum or Tumm; or, as we know not precisely the sound of the Greek υ, by TP, TF, TM, TMM, (Τυπτω, ετυπον, τετυφα, τετυμμαι.) This is not peculiar to the verb *Tupto*; (Τυπτω,) as the Grammarians have themselves informed us, that it is the appropriate nature and quality of a certain Race of verbs, which have P, B, F, P*h*, in one tense to assume *M* in another, "Præteritum Perfectum," say our instructors, "formatur a Præterito Activo mutando in conjugatione "prima Φα purum in Μμαι, M geminato, ut Τετυφα, Τετυμμαι, Φα "impurum in Μαι, ut Τετερφα, Τετερμαι." I might here observe, that in various other Languages, the TP, TM, &c. convey the same fundamental idea of *Beating—Striking*, &c. Thus Tap, Tappen, (Germ.) Thump, Thumbo, Thombo, (Ital.) &c. are acknowledged to have some relation to Tupto, Tetummai, (Τυπτω); and it is even seen, that the Greek Doupos, Δουπος,) and Thambein, (Θαμβειν, Perterrefacere,) may have some affinity to these words. The Etymologists however have not seen, that Thumb, Daum, (Germ.) &c. *s*Tump, *s*Tamp, *s*Tep, &c. &c. with a great Race of words to be found through the whole compass of Language, must be referred to the same idea. We shall at once see, how the abstract representation of the idea of *Beating* or Tapping in various Languages by the Elelementary form D, S, T, }M, P, MP, &c. &c. tends to assist our imagination in bringing at once all these words, within the sphere of Affinity.

The Greeks are not the only people, whose minds or organs disposed them to fall into these Labial changes. Every Welshman will inform us, that in their language, at this very hour, the same mutations are familiar. Even in different positions of the same same word, P, B, M*h* and P*h*, are changed into each other. "Words primarily be- "ginning with P" have four initials, says Richards; "P, B, M*h*, P*h*, "as *Pen gwr*, a man's head; *ei Ben*, his head; *fy Mhen*, my head; "*ei Phen*, her head." In these instances, Pen, Ben, Mhen, Phen, are different forms for the name of the *Head*. The ordinary Etymologists are aware of these changes. M, as they have told us, was used by the Æolians for P, as Mato for Pato, to *walk*, (Ματω, Πατω,

 ambulo.)

ambulo.) They understand, that MORFE, (Μορφη,) and FORMA—MURMEEKS, (Μυρμηξ,) and FORMICA, &c. &c. belong to each other; and Robert Ainsworth has observed the constant union of M with B, P, in a vein of metaphor worthy of an Etymologist. "M," says he, "doth not refuse to usher in its sister labials, B and P, as in *Ambulo* "and *Amplus*." I have appealed to these common instances, and quoted these humble authorities, for the purpose of impressing the fact on the mind of my Reader, and to shew, that the connexion between M, B, F, P, is apparent on the most familiar occasions, and acknowledged by our ordinary Philologists.

It is only by observing the actual changes, which take place in a great variety of words, that we can fully understand the precise mode, by which these changes are effected. The Letter M, in the arrangement of the Etymologist, must be confounded with the other Labials; yet on some occasions we may observe a shade of difference, by which M appears to be distinguished from the others. At the end of a word or syllable no difference appears; and they are all in this position confounded with each other. In the beginning of a word, however, the *M* seems to be separated from the other Labials, under some barrier of distinction, by which it maintains its place to the exclusion of the rest, as in the instance of *Mother* and its parallels; in the changes of which, as we perceive, the other Labials have not intruded. We may conceive, that something of this sort happens, by observing the operations of Language, with which we are most familiar. We see, that the M perpetually connects itself with the other Labials P and B, &c. at the end of a word or syllable; as *thu*MP, *thu*MB, *bu*MP*er*, &c., though we do not familiarly observe the same union at the beginning of a word; but we generally find, that the *M* remains alone, and separated from its sister Labials. We find however, that the M is familiarly applied in conjunction with the other labials in the first syllable of a word, or in words of one syllable, when it is preceded by a vowel breathing, as in *a*MB*ulo*, *a*MP*lus*, *a*MP*hi*, *a*MP*elos*, (Αμφι,—Circa, Αμπελος, Vitis.) In modern Greek, however, the M precedes the B at the beginning of a word, when no symbol for a Vowel breathing appears. The liquid L, as it

is

is called, is a familiar organical addition to the Labials, though we shall perpetually find, that the ML, PL, in a word, is a significant Radical, as in *Ambulo*, *Amplus*, &c. The Etymologists have remarked the union between *M* and *N*, which should be extended to the other Labials, where the *n* may almost always be considered as an organical addition, without any Radical meaning appropriate to itself, or as belonging to MN, BN, &c., as *ter*M*a*, (Τερμα,) *ter*M*i*NUS, *ste*F*o*, *ste*F*a*NOO, (Στεφω, Corono, Στεφανοω, Corono, &c. &c. This union is perpetual. In the organs of some nations the sound of *s* is annexed to P, F; and hence the Greeks have their letter Ψ, *Psi*, which represents the union of these sounds. But this union, which seldom appears, opens into no facts important in the Art of Etymology.

Let us now consider the Consonants in the second Class; C, D, G, J, K, Q, S, T, X, Z, which, as I maintain, familiarly pass into each other, to the exclusion of the rest, in the ordinary operations of Language. The Grammarians have observed, that T, D, T*h*, (T, Δ, Θ,) are *Cognate* with each other, and that K, G, C*h*, (K, Γ, X,) are *Cognate* with each other; but they ought to have seen, that they are *all Cognate* or Commutable with each other. In the examples of *Mother*, *Father* and *Brother*, before produced, we have seen only the T and D *Changed* into each other; but in the example of *Daughter* we have D, T *Changed* into each other at the beginning of the word, and G*h*T, GT, T, C*h*T, K*h*T, in the middle or end of the word; where we see the two Classes blended with each other. Among the parallel terms produced by Wachter for MUTER, *Mother*, we find the Sclavonic words MAC, MACIER, MACZ, MACZER, MASS, MATE, MATKA; where we see, how the C, CZ, S, TK are likewise to be added, as *Commutable* Consonants with the D, T, T*h*. The Greek Verbs will fully illustrate the same changes. In TASSO and TATTO, (Τασσω, Ταττω,) TS and TT signify 'To Arrange;' and in *e*TAG*on*, TAKSO or TAXO, *te*TACH*a*, (Εταγον, Ταξω, Τεταχα,) the TKS, TX, TC*h*, have the same meaning; and thus we see, that S, T, KS or X, C*h*, are *Cognate* or *Commutable* Consonants. Again, FRAZO, To Speak, becomes FRASO, *e*FRAD-*on*, *pe*FRAKA, (Φραζω, Φρασω, Εφραδον, Πεφρακα,) where we perceive, that Z, S, D, K or C, are *Cognate* or *Commutable* into

into each other. Thus we perceive, how the two Classes T, D, T*h*, K, G, C*h*, are inseparably blended and confounded with each other. We perceive moreover, that other Letters Z, X and S, are introduced, which must be added to the same Series of Commutable Letters.

The *S* has been considered by the Grammarians as a Letter invested with a power peculiar to itself. "Σ est suæ potestatis litera." The Letter S is not distinguished by any privileges, which are denied to other Letters. In the ordinary distribution of our Alphabets, every Letter may be considered as a Letter of its own power, or as having a power or property, peculiar to itself. Still, however, certain Letters may have a power—property or propensity to pass into each other, without any disturbance of this peculiar property, by which they are distinguished from each other; or any derangement of the particular degrees of Affinity, which these Letters may bear to each other. Different modes of classing Letters may have their use, according to the different purposes, to which their classification is applied. Yet no division can be more faulty and imperfect than that of the Grammarians, which we have just exhibited, respecting the *Cognate* Letters, when considered under their property of *Commutability* into each other, in the inflexions of Nouns and Verbs. We see most unequivocally, that in the Inflexions of Verbs, the Letters C or C*h*, D, G, K, S, T, X, Z, pass familiarly or are changed into each other, whatever may be their peculiar relation to each other, or the precise process, by which this change is produced. We do not obtain from the Greek verbs any distinct evidence of the peculiar relation or the degrees of Affinity, which these Letters bear to each other, though it does not from hence follow, that such degrees of Affinity may not exist. Thus it may still be, that T, D, T*h*, which some call *Dentals*, and K, G, C*h*, which some call *Palatines*, form two sets, in some measure, distinct from each other, as containing Letters more particularly related to each other. I have no objection to this idea, or to this mode of division, for certain purposes, and on certain occasions; but I still affirm, that it is a division, entirely false, as applied to the definition of the Grammarians, and altogether useless and improper for all the purposes of the Etymologist. We know, that the

the sound of Q is similar to that of C, C*h*, or of the hardened G, with the vowel *u* after them; and that J is nothing but one of the sounds annexed to *G*, as in *George*, which might have been written *Jeorge*; and thus we see, that the letters C, D, G, J, K, Q, S, T, X, Z, should be arranged in the same Class as Letters, which are *Cognate* or *Commutable* into each other, in the ordinary operations of Language.

Similar facts are exhibited in the Latin Verbs. Thus C is changed into X, CT, as *di*C*o*, *di*X*i*, *di*CT*um*, by a general analogy, and sometimes into S and T, as *par*C*o*, *par*S*i*, *par*S*um*, *sar*C*io*, *sar*S*i*, *sar*T*um*; —D into S, as *ra*D*o*, *ra*S*i*, *ra*S*um*;—G into X and CT by a general rule *re*G*o*, *re*X*i*, *re*CT*um*, and sometimes into S, as *mer*G*o*, *mer*S*i*, *mer*S*um*;—Q into X and CT, as *co*Q*uo*, *co*X*i*, *co*CT*um*;—SC into T and ST, *no*SC*o*, *no*T*um*, *pa*SC*o*, *pa*ST*um*;—T into S, and CT into X, as *mi*TT*o*, *mi*S*i*, *mi*SS*um*;—CT into X, *fle*CT*o*, *fle*X*i*, *fle*X*um*. In the Latin and Greek Nouns the same changes are likewise visible. Thus, in Latin, C is changed into CT, as *la*C, CT*is*; —S into D, T, as *pe*S, *pe*D*is*, *par*S, *par*T*is*, &c. &c.;—X into C, G, CT, as *pa*X, *pa*C*is*, *le*X, *le*G*is*, *no*X, *no*CT*is*. In Greek, S passes into T, Th and D, as *gel*}*o*S, *o*T-*os*, *kor*}*u*S, *u*Th-*os*, *lamp*}*a*S, *a*D-*os*, (Γελως, τος, Κορυς, θος, Λαμπας, δος,) X into K, KT, G, C*h*, as *kul*}*i*X, *i*K-*os*, *an*}*a*X, CT-*os*, *tett*}*i*X, *i*G-*os*, *be*X, *bee*C*hos*, (Κυλιξ, κος, Αναξ, κτος,; Τεττιξ, γος, Βηξ, βηχος.)

The various offices, which these Letters perform in modern Languages, would be abundantly sufficient to attest their Affinity. In our own Language, C is used for S and K, as in *City* and *Cap*, quasi *Sity*, *Kap*; and T has the sound of S*h*, as *na*T*ion*, quasi *na*SH*ion* or *na*TS*hion*. In the Spanish Language, the C is sounded like *Th*, before some Vowels, and like the K before others; and when *h* follows the C, "it is pronounced," says Del Pueyo, "as in the English *muCh*, "*muCho*." In German, C is represented by *TSay*; and before some Vowels it is sounded like TS. In Italian, C is sounded like *TCh*, as in *Cesare*, *Cecita*, which is pronounced 'T*Chesare*, *TCheTCh*ita,' in so delicate a manner, that you cannot distinguish, says Veneroni, whether a T or D be sounded. "Pour parler avec la delicatesse "Italienne, il faut faire sentir le T de *Tchesare*, *Tchetchita*, &c. si "doucement, que l'on ne connoisse pas, si l'on prononce un T ou "un

"un D." Veneroni represents the sound of the Italian G, and GG, before the Vowels *e, i*, by DG, as *Giro, Oggi, DGiro, o*DG*i*. We may from hence see, how *Oggi* or *o*DG*i*, may belong to *ho*D*ie*, and how *Dgiro* or *Tgiro, Giro, Guros*, (Γυρος, *Gyrus*,) may belong to such terms as *Tour, Tour-n-er*, (Fr.) *Tur-n*, &c. &c., with a great race of parallel words to be found through a wide compass of Human Speech.

The Affinity of the Cognate Consonants C, D, G, &c., such as they are detailed in the present arrangement, will enable us to understand, from what source has arisen that cluster of Consonants, which certain writers have so violently and unwisely condemned in some Languages, as in the German, &c. It has arisen from an attempt at extreme accuracy in expressing those different sounds existing in different Cognate Consonants, which the speaker combines together at the same time. These mingled sounds are to be found, in a greater or less degree, in all forms of Speech, which differ chiefly in this respect, than in some Languages more precision is employed in representing that combination of sounds by the power of symbols. One Language adopts the various characters, which are separately used to express the different sounds, of which the combination is formed, while another employs a single and peculiar symbol for that purpose; and a third contents itself with adopting a character, sometimes used for one of those mixed sounds, of which the union consists.

In our own Language this combination of sounds has been strongly felt by other nations; and we accordingly find, that the representation of our words by Foreigners is loaded with Consonants, for the purpose of conveying to the ears of their countrymen the nature of those combined sounds, about which we so little reflect, and which we ourselves are satisfied with expressing by a single symbol. Thus in a German Dictionary, now before me, I find the sounds of our letters C or C*h* and J, generally represented by TSC*h* and DSC*h* as in *Church* and *Judge*, by TSC*hohr*TC*h*, and DSC*ho*DSC*h*; The sound of the G in *Genius* I likewise find to be represented by DS*Chenius*. The Sclavonic Dialects exhibit likewise most fully this union of sounds. In the Russian Language, the sound of two Letters has been represented by TS, TC*h*; and the enunciation of a third appears to be of

so

so complicated a nature, that in an attempt to express this sound to a French ear, the author of my Russian Grammar represents it by C*h*TC*h*, "en faisant tres peu sentir le T." In the Eastern Languages, this relation of the Cognate Consonants C, D, G, &c. is peculiarly observable, as well by their uniou, as their separation. To some ears the sounds of these allied Consonants have appeared mingled; and to others they have appeared single; and hence we find so great a variety in representing the same term among the Travellers into the East. We shall perpetually observe, that this proceeds solely from the cause developed in my hypothesis; namely, that certain Consonants, *Cognate* or allied to each other, familiarly pass into each other, in representing the same idea, and that the Vowels are promiscuously changed into each other. If we do not allow this principle, we have no evidence to assert, that the following terms are at all related to each other. Dr. Vincent has detailed the various modes, under which different writers have represented one part of a compound, expressing a River in India, after the following manner; "*DJen, D an, TSChan, TSChen, Chan, Chen, Chin, Jen, Gen, TSChun, Chun, Shan, San.*" (*Voyage of Nearchus.*)

From considering this combination of Cognate Consonants, we shall be led to a very important observation in the developement of Language. The difficulty in unravelling the origin of a word consists in discovering the true Radical form, concealed under the Consonants, by which it is represented. The two letters, between which no Vowel breathing is inserted at the beginning of a Word, may sometimes represent the Radical form, but they may likewise only represent the combination of sounds, annexed to what we may consider as the first Letter of the Radical. Thus the Elementary form of the above terms *DJen*, &c. I consider to be CN, DN, &c.; and hence the $\overline{\text{DJ}}$, $\overline{\text{TSC}}h$ may be regarded as representing only the first *Consonant* in the Radical. Whenever I imagine this to be the fact, I shall commonly place a line over such Letters, $\overline{\text{DJ}}$, $\overline{\text{TSC}}h$ in representing the Radical form $\overline{\text{DJN}}$; and whenever no such line is placed, each Consonant is supposed to represent one of the Radical Consonants. It is easy to understand, that a Vowel breathing would readily insinuate itself

itself in the attempt to enunciate a combination of sounds, representing the first Letter of the Radical. Thus it might have happened in some of the terms above produced, and the *Tschun*, &c. might have become *Teschun*. We should always have our attention awake to this circumstance, as to a matter of great importance in discovering the true Radical Characters. If such a fact, as I have supposed, had really taken place, and we had been induced from hence to imagine, that TS was the Radical instead of TN, SN, &c., all our labour to arrange the word in its due place would have been vain and fruitless.

The third of the Classes, into which I have divided the Alphabet for the purposes of Etymology, is L, N, R, the Letters of which Class may be considered as distinct from each other in the familiar operations of Language, and to be governed by laws, which demand a separate discussion. The Letters L, M, N, R, are called by the Grammarians *Liquids*, and sometimes *Immutables*:—"Liquidæ vel "Immutabiles, Λ, M, N, P:" and the reason, which the Grammarians give for their being called *Immutables*, is thus described; "Quæ non "Literas *Antistoichas* vel *Cognatas*, quibus ipsæ mutentur in verborum "et nominum inflexionibus, habent." Robert Ainsworth observes on this definition, "All the *Liquids* by the Grammarians are called "*Immutables*, as in fact they are with respect to the Mutes, but not "in regard to themselves, which is evident from Νυμφη, *Lympha*, "*Ager*, *Agellus*, Λειριον, *Lilium*, Παυρος, *Paulus*." Though most of these examples are unfortunately chosen, yet the fact sometimes takes place on certain occasions, and in the organs of some nations. These changes, however, are so rare, that they produce no effect in the general arrangements of Language. The Letter L first demands our attention. The Etymologist must consider the L as most intimately connected with the two Classes C, D, &c. B, F, &c., not as being changed into them, but as having the Letters of these Classes perpetually attached to it, both as following and preceding it, in expressing the same or similar ideas. The N and R likewise follow the L, though not so frequently and familiarly. We may thus represent the L as connected with the Letters, which I have detailed, C, &c. B, &c. }ᴧL{ c, &c. B, &c. N, R; where we may observe, that this general representation

tion resolves itself into various forms. The L may be the first Consonant of the word, with or without a Vowel preceding it, and with or without the Letters c, &c. b, &c. n, r, following it, or the L may be preceded by C, &c. B, &c. without or with the other Letters following it. We all know, that the L is found in words, under all these positions, and forms; but we do not know, that all these forms, different as they may appear, present to us, in the familiar operations of Language, *a series of Words* which must be considered as *directly belonging to each other.* These different forms constitute indeed, in various degrees, different Radicals, distinct from each other; yet we may observe, that through the whole compass of Language, wherever we have an L existing as the first Consonant of a Word, we may always expect to find a series of words, *directly* connected with each other, under some or all of the other forms, which I have above detailed. Those, who are ignorant of this law in the structure of Languages, as I imagine every one to be, will be astonished to find, how *familiarly* and *constantly* this fact presents itself, in the most impressive and unequivocal manner.

There are but few facts, within the reach of discovery, of which some traces have not before been perceived. The connexion of C with L at the beginning of a word, in some instances, has been understood; yet on the extensive influence of this relation, and on the other points, which I have just unfolded, it may be justly said, that no conception whatever has been formed. The Spanish Grammarians have told us, that the double L, as LL in their Language, is pronounced "as in Italian GL or LL in French, which sounds as if an *i* "was after the first L, as in *LLevar, LLorar, Vasa*LLe." Though this is a very imperfect description, we gather something of the fact; and we see in *LLorar*, what they all agree, that LL belongs to the PL in Latin, as *PLoro*; and they acknowledge likewise, that *LLover*, To Rain; *LLuvia*, Rain; *LLenar*, To Fill; *LLano, Plain; LLave*, A Key; *LLamar*, To Call, belong to *PLuo, PLuvius, PLenus, PLanus, CLavis* and *CLamo.* We see the simple form of PL*enus* in PL*eo*, the ancient Latin word,—PL*eos*, (Πλεος,) and in the English FuLL; and

in our term CALL, with the Greek KALeo, (Καλεω, Voco,) we see a simple form of CLamo. In the Italian article, *GLi*, we see, how the *G* is connected with the L; and in that Language the same union of the G with the L at the end of a syllable, both before and after the L, is familiar, where no *G* appears in the parallel terms, as *Voglio, Voler, Salgo* or *Saglio, Salire, Togliere* or *Tollere*, &c. &c., belonging to the Latin *Volo, Salio, Tollo.* The appearance of G before the L at the end of a syllable, so familiar in Italian, is not so common in other forms of Speech, in the process of Words passing through different Languages.

It is well known, that a peculiarity of sound is annexed to the Welsh LL, which the Grammarians find it difficult to express. Mr. Richards describes it thus: "LL is L aspirated, and has a sound "peculiar to the Welsh. It is pronounced by fixing the tip of the "tongue to the roof of the mouth, and breathing forcibly through the "jaw-teeth on both sides, but more on the right, as if written in "English LL*h*." We see, how by this operation with the roof of the mouth and the teeth, the Palatials and Dentals are brought into action; that is, how the sounds of C, D, &c. are mingled with the L. To my organs of hearing the Dentals appear most to prevail in the enunciation of this combined sound; and when I first wrote down words from the mouths of the Welsh, I was surprized to find many terms, according to my representation, with an initial T, conveying certain ideas; which, as I well knew, were not familiarly expressed under that form, but which were generally represented by words, in which the *L* was conspicuous, as *Thug*, which I wrote for *Lhug, Light*, &c. &c. This union of the Dental sound with *L* will shew us, why we find, belonging to each other, *UL*YSSES and ODUSSEUS, (Οδυσσευς,) POLLUX and POLUDEUKES, (Πολυδευκης,) GILES and *æ-oGIDius*, &c. &c. These changes create no difficulty or confusion, when the laws of change are sufficiently understood.

The Reader will be enabled, by the following examples, to form some idea of the fact, which I before asserted, that the words with L as

L as the first Consonant, appear likewise under the forms CL, BL, sometimes with the additions of c, &c. and b, &c. after the L, as C, &c. B, &c.}L{c, b, &c. Thus Lac in Latin is in Greek Gala, Galactos, *ga*Lactos, (Γαλα, Γαλακτος,) and in Celtic we have *Lhaeth*, *Lait*, &c. In *g*Lagos, *g*Lax, (Γλαγος, Γλαξ, Lac,) the breathing between the G and L is lost. We find likewise in the Celtic Dialects *Blith*, *Bloχd*, *Meilg*, as they are represented by Lhuyd, where we perceive, that the Labial sound is introduced before the L. Let us mark the name of this illustrious Celt, *Lhuyd*, corresponding with our familiar name *LLoyd*; and let us remember *FLoyd*, &c. We perceive in the Celtic Meilg, how we are brought to the English *Milk*, the Latin Mulg*eo*, and the Greek *a*Melgo, (Αμελγω.) The form of Blith will bring us to the Greek Blitto, (Βλιττω, Exprimendo aufero, ut mel e favis,) which will shew us, that the sense of the Fluid *Milk* is taken from the action of *Milking*, as relating to the idea of *Expressing* or *Squeezing*. Among the terms for *Lux* in Lhuyd I find *Golou*, *Solus*, *Golug*, *Glus*, *Lhygad*, *Les*, *Leos*. We here see, that the Sol*us* brings to us the Latin Sol; and that the form Lhug, Les, &c. brings us to Lux, Light, &c. &c. We shall agree, that Cl*ear*, Cl*ean*, Cl*arus*, &c. belong to these words Gol*ou*, &c.: and we cannot doubt, I think, that El*ios*, (Ηλιος, Sol,) is attached likewise to the same words, when the sound of *g* in *g*-^*L* is not heard.

Among the terms for Lut*um* I find, in Lhuyd, KLai, Kall*ar*, Klada*χ*, Lhaid, Klab*ar*, Lab*an*; and we remember the English Clay, which in some places is called Gwalt, together with the Latin *ar*Gill*a*, and the Greek *ar*Gill*os*, (Αργιλος.) We here see the forms CL, KL and GL, in Cl*ay*, Kl*ai*, Gill; and we have the Consonants d, t and b, attached to the Radical KL, together with r, &c. We perceive, how Lhaid coincides with Lad and Lut, in *k*Lad*aχ* and Lut*um*, and how the Lab in *k*Lab*ar*, and Lab*an* is the same. We cannot help noting, how the English words Slime, Slop, Slip, &c. &c. belong to the form Klab, where the Labials succeed the *L*; and we cannot but again observe, how we pass from this form to Lim*us*, (Lat.) Loam, Lime, (Eng.) *Labor*, i. e. To Slide, &c. Let us mark in Slide, Glide, how the *d* is annexed to the L; and among the

the parallel terms for LABor, in Lhuyd, we have the Irish SLEAVnayim, SLADam, and GLUAISim, the Armoric LAMPra, and the Welsh LHITHro. Here SLEAV coincides in form with SLIP;—SLAD and GLUAIS, with SLIDE, GLIDE;—LAMP with LAB, &c., LHITH with LHAID, &c. We see in some words, how the R is added, as in *Klabar, Lhithro*, &c., and as it is likewise in *Slaver, Slobber, Slither*, in colloquial Language, &c. It is impossible not to see, that SOLum, SOIL, &c. CLOD, CHALK, SLATE, SLUDGE, SILEX, CALX, CHALIX, (Χαλιξ,) belong to these terms for CLAY, KLAI, &c.; and we must even on this slight view perceive, how widely extended the words are under these various forms, which relate to *Dirt—Mud*, &c.

This perhaps will prepare our minds for my hypothesis, which supposes, that Languages are formed from terms relating to the *Earth, Ground*, the SOLum, SOIL, CLAY, &c. &c. The term CALX, which I have just produced, relates at once to the *Ground*, and to the *Heel*, the treader upon it. Let us mark in the H of HEEL, the approximation to the CAL; and in the *LX* of the Latin word we see, how we may pass into that form, which has actually taken place in the Greek LAX, (Λαξ, Calce, &c.) In the Irish SAL we see the term without the additions to the L. While I examine CALX, denoting the *Heel*, in Lhuyd, I perceive among other terms for the same word, denoting CHALK or Lime, CALχ, (Welsh,) &c. and YIL, (Irish,) where in YIL, or, as it appears in Mr. Shaw, AOL, Lime, we simply see the L, with the vowel breathing before it, as in the Greek IL-*us*, ULE, (Ιλυς, Cœnum, Υλη, Materia quævis.) We have seen terms under the same Radical SL and CL, &c., relating at once to what is CLEAR—LIGHT, and to CLAY, *Mud, Dirt*, &c., what is *Foul—Dark, Dingy*, &c., ideas, as it should seem, directly opposite to each other. We shall now however understand, that 'What is CLEAR, CLEAN,' &c. is nothing but that object, from which the CLAY, *Mud, Dirt*, &c. is removed—the CLAYED-out place, if I may so say. We know, that *Mud* is applied in an active sense, under this idea, when we talk of *Mudding*-out a Pond; and in the expressions 'To CLEAR off the *Dirt*—To CLEAN 'the *Shoes*,' &c. &c., we see the terms used in their original idea of removing CLAY or *Dirt*. Thus we see, how SOL, and SOL*um* remote

as

as they appear from each other, even as the Heavens from the Earth, are in truth derived from the same lowly spot, and are alike creatures of the same CLAY *.

I do not attempt to adjust the precise process, by which these various

---

* These various forms, which are assumed by CL, KL, &c. will shew us, whence it has arisen, that the illustrious nation, I had almost said, the only nation of the Globe, the CELTS, has been represented under such various forms as the GAELS, GALLI GAULS, CELTÆ, KELTÆ, GALATÆ, WELSH, WALD*enses*, BELGÆ, &c. All these changes are acknowledged, but nothing has been seen of the great, or rather universal extent, to which the names of this nation have proceeded. Hence we have the SCOLOTI, the ancient name of the *Scythians*, (and when the *l* is lost, the *Scythae—Scots—Goths*, *Coti*, &c. &c.) the CHALD*eans*, the GALIL*eans*—the Irish GADOLS, the GÆTULI, &c.; and under this form, when the sound of *g* is lost, quasi ADOLS, the ATL-*antidæ*, ÆTOLI, ITALI, EADIALT, (the Galic form for ITALI,) which same ITAL*ians* are sometimes called LAT*ins*; — LUS*itania*; — CILIC*ia*, the CAL-*Mucks*, or *Moguls*; i. e. *Mac*-GULS, the *Macs* or Sons of GAELS;—the SCLAV*onians*;—CALED*onia*;—CASTILE, CATAL*onia*; *Andalusia*, quasi ADAL*usia*, the country of the *g*-ADALS;—the *an*GL*i*, or *en*GL*ish*;—the *amy*-CL*eei*, the LAC*ones*, or LAC*edæmonians*, &c. &c. With a vowel only before the L, we have the AL-*bani*, AL-*bion*, a name for England and Scotland, or *c*-AL*edonia*, the *g*-AEL country; AL*ani*, ELL*enes*, (Ελληνες,) the ALLO-*Broges*, the *g*-ALLI *Braccæ*, *Brigæ*, &c. or *Britons*, the ALA=*manni*, &c. With the Labial before the L we have the BELGÆ, WELSH, WALLD*enses*, (which become *Vaudois*,) PELASGI, PHILIST*ines*, PALES*tine*, POLES, or POLACKS, the PELHEV*i*, the ancient Language of Persia, PELOP*onnesus*, the VOLSCI, &c. &c. To the various derivations of this great nation I shall now propose another, and I may venture to affirm a new origin. The CELTS, I humbly conceive, originally signified the workers in CLAY, &c., the Artists who made Bricks for Building—Vessels of Pottery, &c. &c.; and hence *Builders—Architects—Potters*, &c. &c. That is, they signified the Illustrious persons who were the great Artists of the ancient World. Under the same idea I imagine, that the *Titans*, a Celtic Race, did not denote the people *born* from the *Earth*, but *Workers* in *Earth—Clay*—DUST, if I may so say,) TITAN*os*, (Τιτανος, Calx, Gypsus,) TETH*us*, (Τεθυς, Terra,) TEUT, Terra, (Wachter sub voce,) טִיט TIT, "Mire, Mud, Clay." We shall hence understand, that the mountains, which these personages piled up in order to assault Heaven, are nothing but the Piles of Buildings which they reared into the Skies. This, I imagine, must have been seen by some of our enquirers into the Mysteries of Mythology; but the origin of the CELTS, together with its train of consequences, is, I may venture to suppose totally unknown. The Master Key to the inmost recesses of Mythology is yet undiscovered. It is to be found however by those, who will search with care and diligence, in a *Chinese tradition*, which opens into a wide and bright glimpse of the History and Mythology of the Ancient World.

various forms C, &c. B, &c.} ^L} c, &c. B, &c. R, N, pass into each other. Under one point of view the Reader, if he pleases, may consider the ^L in its simple state, with a vowel breathing before it, as the original, Elementary Character, and that all the other forms have arisen from it, by organical attraction—accretion, addition, &c. Let us suppose then, that the forms CL, &c.} ^L or CL, &c. and B, &c.} ^L or BL, &c. have arisen from the more simple form ^L; and in order to conceive, why these forms have been so familiarly attached to each other, in the same series of Words, let us imagine, that the sound, preceding the ^L, was of a mixed kind, such as that, which is represented by QU, QV. This combination of sounds QV, which is a mixture of the two classes C, &c. and B, &c. is familiar and predominant in Languages. We know, that the Latin Q was adopted in order to be employed in expressing this union of sounds; and hence the Q never appears without the U following it. From this source it is, that we see such a variety of words under the forms of QU, GU, &c., and of W, which seems to represent with us the first step, by which the Labials and the Gutturals G, C, C*h*, as some call them, pass into each other. Hence we have *Guerre, War*; *Gualterus, Walter*; *Gulielmus, William*, &c. &c. By this mode of conceiving the matter we shall more readily understand, how from the form QV} ^L, congenial races of words may have arisen under the forms CL, &c. BL, &c., as the sound of the Guttural, Q, C, &c., or that of the Labial, V, &c. may chance to predominate. Let us now imagine the sounds of c, &c. B, &c. R, N, to be annexed to the form QV} ^L, and then we shall have QV or C, &c. B, &c.} ^L} c, &c. B, &c. R, N. When the sound of *qv* or *c*, &c. *b*, &c. is not heard, we have then the forms ^L, L} c, &c. B, &c. R, N, with or without the Vowel breathing before the L. The loss of the sounds *c* and *b* before L will be made perhaps more intelligible, by imagining the Vowel to be lost between these Letters, as in *g*Lax, (Γλαξ,) which would hence immediately become Lac, Lact*is*, &c. We might imagine, that the accretions c, &c. B, &c. R, N, succeeding ^L, took place before the accretions C, &c. B, &c. preceded the L, and this perhaps may often happen. Yet I seem frequently to perceive, that the form ^L} c, &c. B, &c.

R, N,

R, N, is directly taken from that of C, &c. B, &c. }L{ C, B, &c. R, N. These however are minute points which it is impossible to adjust, and which do not refer to the discovery of those facts, about which only I am concerned.

As a *modus concipiendi*, the Reader perhaps would find it convenient to consider the ^L in its simple state, as the *original Elementary* form; yet he must bear in mind, that this is merely a *mode of conceiving* the matter, useful only in these few pages, in which is introduced an attempt at some Theoretical arrangement; and that it is totally foreign from the consideration of that great body of facts, which relate to the actual affinity of words to each other, as they are destined to be unfolded in some future Volume of our Researches on Languages. We shall there find, that the forms CL, &c. BL, &c. may be considered, under one point of view, as distinct Radicals; and that they supply two great families of words separated and distinguished from each other. Their coincidence however will be frequently seen in marked and distinct characters; and this coincidence will be peculiarly and almost perpetually visible, when we examine the words, in which L is the first Consonant. We might perhaps state the case by observing, that the forms CL, &c. BL, &c. exhibit great Races of words, which occasionally only connect themselves with terms, in which L appears as the first Consonant; but that the terms, in which L thus appears, are perpetually connected with the forms CL, &c. BL, &c. Under this view of the case, we should say perhaps that the words, in which L appeared as the first Consonant, were *not* to be considered as *Radicals*, but as *Dependant* and *Subordinate* forms.

This *modus concipiendi* likewise may be useful, when we involve ourselves in the discussion of the *Facts*, which relate to these various forms. I must add however, that though this may be justly affirmed, in contemplating the numerous Races of Words, which Language presents to us in its improved state; yet the same Theory may still be adopted, which I have before exhibited. The L may still be conveniently and justly enough considered as the *primitive Elementary sound*, from whence the great Radical Characters CL, &c. BL, &c. originally arose, which have supplied Languages in their advanced

advanced state with such abundant Races of words. I must again and again repeat, that this is merely a *modus concipiendi*, totally useless in discovering the *Facts* relating to the Affinities of words. Still, however, as it does not impede that discovery, and as it coincides with some obscure notions about Language, which have at all times been adopted by Grammarians—Philologists, &c. &c. it may be safely and conveniently admitted among those maxims, which profess only to exert their force within the humble and contracted sphere of *Theoretical Arrangement*. These are all the observations, which I conceive it necessary to make on the accidents or properties attached to the Letter L; from whence we have seen, that these properties do not consist in any *changes* which the L suffers by passing into other Letters, but by the aptitude, which it has of attracting before and after it organical accretions, in the ordinary operations of Language, in such a manner, that Words are *familiarly* generated *directly connected with each other*, under the various forms in which L appears as a Radical Consonant. This observation must be well weighed and understood, as it is by this property, that the Letter L is distinguished from all other Letters*.

I shall

---

* It may be expedient perhaps in this place to explain some marks, and to elucidate more particularly a vein of phraseology, which I have chosen to adopt in the explanation of my Theory, though they are made, I trust, sufficiently intelligible by the mode, in which they are introduced. In my representation of a Race of Words by Consonants only, as CL, BL, CLG, BLG, &c. I decide nothing on the place, in which the Vowel breathings are introduced, except that I suppose no Vowel breathing to exist before the first Consonant. When I mean to express, that a Vowel breathing exists before the first or the only Consonant, I use the familiar mark of a *caret* ʌ, in order to signify, that a Vowel breathing is wanting, or is to be supplied before that Consonant, or that ʌL, for example, represents a Race of words, in which a Vowel breathing is found before the ʌL, as ALL, (Eng.) UL*e*, &c. (Υλη.) I decide nothing in this representation about the Vowel breathing after it, which may or may not exist. If the L were to stand alone without a Vowel breathing before it, we shall at once see, that a Vowel breathing must exist after the L, as *Luo*, in order to constitute a word; and I have sometimes in this case placed a *caret* after the Letter, as Lʌ. Thus, then, ʌL, Lʌ, would represent all the words, in which L was found alone, whether a Vowel breathing does or does not exist before

I shall next examine the Letter ^R, as it may be regarded under one point of view, like L, as a great Elementary Character, which supplies

---

before the L. I have sometimes supposed the L with a *caret* before it to represent the words in which L is the Radical, whether the vowel breathing precedes or follows it. In representing a general formula, with a Radical Consonant preceding L, I have generally omitted the *caret* before L. Under the general representation C, &c. B, &c. $\}$L$\{$ C, &c. B, &c. R, N, we shall find expressed the following forms; 1. Those belonging to ^L or L^ alone, with or without the vowel breathing before the L, as ALL, *Ule*, (Υλη,) *Luo*, &c. 2. Those belonging to ^L$\{$ C, &c., or to L having C or its Cognates added, with or without the breathing before L, as *Alector*, (Αλεκτωρ, Gallus,) *Lac*, *Lactis*, &c. 3. Those belonging to ^L$\{$ B, &c., or to L with B and its cognate Labials, as *Albus*, *Labium*, *Lip*, &c. &c. 4. Those belonging to ^L$\{$ R, or to L with *r* following, as *Ilaros*, (Ιλαρος, *Hilaris*,) *Lira* (Lat.) 5. Those belonging to ^L$\{$ N, or L with N following, as *Olene*, (Ωλενη, Cubitus,) *Luna*. With C, &c. B, &c. preceding these forms L$\{$ C, &c. B, &c. R, N, we have Terms, in which C or any of its Cognates is the first Letter, or the labial B or any of its Cognates is the first Letter—L the second Radical Consonant, with C or any of its Cognates or with B or any of its Cognates, or with R, or N, following, as under the form CL, &c. or C, &c.$\{$L, as CALL, CLAY, GALL*us*, &c., under BL and B, &c.$\{$L, BALL, PILL, &c. under C, &c.$\{$L$\{$ C, &c. CHALK, SILEX, &c. under B, &c.$\{$L$\{$ C, &c. BALK, BULK, PULSE, &c.—under C, &c.$\{$L$\{$ B, &c. CLUB, GLEBE, GLOBE, &c.—under B, &c.$\{$L$\{$ B, &c. BULB, BLUBB*er*, FLABBY, FLAP, FLAME, &c.—under C, &c.$\{$L$\{$ R, N, as CLEAR, GLARE, &c. CLEAN, GLEAN, &c. &c.—under B, &c.$\{$L$\{$ R, N, as BLEAR, FLEAR, BLAIN, FLANN*el*, &c. &c. I speak of L as the second Radical Consonant in a word, because the Organical Consonants attached to L sometimes precede it. On some occasions I place a line over two Letters, in order to represent, that these Letters express only the combined sounds, which are annexed to what may be considered as the first Radical Consonant. Thus I should express the Elementary character belonging to the word STONE by $\overline{\text{STN}}$, with a line over the $\overline{\text{ST}}$, in order to shew, that the word was attached to the Radical form SN or TN, and not to ST, or that $\overline{\text{ST}}$ represented only the first Letter of the Radical. I have adopted the terms *Element* and *Elementary*, &c., as applied to Consonants, when the Vowels are removed; because I consider the Consonants to be the *Principal—Fundamental—Essential* or *Elementary* parts of Language, by which Races of Words are formed—propagated and preserved separate and distinguished from each other. In the phraseology of the Grammarians, Letters are considered as the *Elements*, of which words are formed; and in my use of the term, I consider, that the Letters, called Consonants, considered in an abstract state, when

supplies various Races of Words. The properties however of the Letter R, when it is viewed under its relations to the other Consonants, are totally different from those properties, which are annexed to the Letter L. The R attracts after it the other Consonants, as the L does; and we might perhaps conjecture, that the C, &c. B, &c. have been placed before it, as C, &c.} R, B, &c.} R, by accretion, from the more simple form ^R. If we were permitted to make this hypothesis, the general representation might, as in the case of L, *mutatis mutandis*, be thus stated, C, &c. B, &c.} R}c, &c. B, &c. L, N. We shall not find however, that Words under these different forms are to be found in the ordinary operations of Language directly connected with each other, as we have seen to be the fact in the case of L. We shall be enabled occasionally to discover by marks sufficiently distinct and apparent, that C, &c.} R, and B, &c.} R, are connected with the simpler form ^R; but this relation bears no resemblance whatever to that, which we have seen to exist under the different forms connected with L. The form C} R, with its appendages c, &c. B, &c. L, N, or C}R}c, &c. B, &c. L, N, is one Radical, and B}^R}c, &c. L, N, is another Radical; and the words, under these Radicals, when taken as a body, may be considered as totally distinct from each other. The different forms C}R}c, &c. B, &c. L, N, as they arise from the appendages, may afford convenient subdivisions; and especially we shall find, that the Labial additions afford oftentimes barriers of distinction. We must however always remember, that it is the first Radical

---

freed from vowel breathings, by which they become vocal only in particular cases, with a particular meaning, represent the *Elementary*, or Fundamental idea, pervading a great Race of words. I sometimes speak likewise of the *Radical* and the *Radical form* CL, &c. and frequently with the same meaning as when I speak of the *Element* and *Elementary form*. If we were enabled however to discover the more original *form*, as it might be ^L, from which the other forms were derived, as CL, BL, &c. we should more justly call ^L, the *Element* or *Elementary* Form, and CL, BL the *Radical* Forms; that is, those Forms, which, though they are derivative from a more primitive form, are yet themselves important *Radicals*, from which great Races of words immediately spring. These gradations cannot be adjusted, and we must be contented to apply our phraseology, according to our imperfect knowledge in the nature of the materials, which pass under our view.

Radical Consonant, when R is the first Radical Letter or the two first Radical Consonants, when R is the second, by which the *fundamental* idea is imparted to the whole Race of words, in which they are found, and that the succeeding Consonants may be considered as appendages only, which operate but imperfectly and subordinately, in propagating and preserving ideas. We shall find indeed, that they do operate, and that they constitute an effective part in the Machinery of Language; by the agency of which, distinct Classes of words are produced, which appear on various occasions, totally separated from each other. Still, however, when we examine these Classes with care and attention; we shall be astonished to find, how frequently they present to us the most unequivocal marks of some common energy, operating through the whole mass.

In the present Volume I shall consider the Race or Races of words, which appear with R as their only Consonant, or as their first Consonant, attended by any of the organical appendages C, &c. B, &c. L, N, with or without a vowel breathing before it. This Race of words may be thus represented, ^R}C, &c. B, &c. L, N, and it may be divided ito different Classes: 1. The form ^R is that, which may be considered, under one point of view, as its more simple state. 2. The form R}C, &c. L, N. 3. The form ^R}B, &c. These forms I have treated in separate divisions of my Work; but why I have commenced with the form ^R}C, &c. will be seen in the progress of these enquiries. It is impossible oftentimes to describe the gradations or subdivisions of Relation, which different forms bear to each other; and they can only be understood by observing the *facts*, which actually exist in Language. Nay, even when we observe these facts; the degrees of affinity cannot always be described, though they may be fully felt and unequivocally understood. We shall see, that the forms ^R, and ^R}C, &c. perpetually pass into each other; and we shall understand, that the Words under the forms ^R}C, D, &c. belong to each other, because the Letters C, D, &c. familiarly pass into each other; and this likewise is the cause of the affinity between words under the forms ^R}B, F, &c.; namely, because the organical appendages B, F, &c. familiarly pass into each other. Words under the forms

forms R}c, &c. and R}B, &c. may be related to each other in the same series of words, not because the c, &c. and B, &c. familiarly pass into each other, but because they may both be directly related to the form ^R. Thus we see, that among other reasons for varieties of affinity between words, one is, that the causes of affinity are different. The mode, by which the Labials become appendages to the R and the L may be at once understood; as it is only to suppose the lips to be closed in the enunciation of these Letters, and the Labials will necessarily be annexed to them. The sounds c, &c. are attached by a process equally natural and easy to the organs; but it is not so easy to describe the operation. Thus, then, we have only to suppose, that the two processes of closing the Lips, by which Labials are produced, and of performing some actions with the teeth, &c., by which Dentals, &c. are produced, to take place in expressing the same idea, which has been enunciated by ^R; and we shall have words under the forms ^R}c, D, &c. and ^R}B, connected with each other in the same series of words, as being both directly related to ^R. Hence we have *hei*R, *hæ*Res, *hæ*Redis, *e*Rbe, (Germ.) &c. &c.

We see, as far as we have already proceeded, that R preserves the character, which the Grammarians have given it, when they place it among the *Immutables*, or those Consonants, which are not changed into other Letters, in the Inflexions of Nouns and Verbs. The Immutability of R considered as a great Radical, is indeed a fundamental truth in Languages, which must be admitted. Still, however R is changed into the Class C, D, &c. with sufficient frequency, as to render the consideration of this property a necessary portion of our discussions on this subject. R. Ainsworth observes on the Letter R, that its sound "is formed in the upper part of the throat, but so "vibrated by a quaver of the tongue, and allision on the teeth, that "it makes a sound like the grinning of a dog, whence it is called the "canine Letter; but the Romans, on the contrary, give it so soft "and lisping a sound, that in writing they sometimes omitted it, "calling the *Etrusci*, *Thusci*, or *Tusci*, and especially before S; thus "Ennius writ *Prosus*, *Rusus*, for *Prorsus*, *Rursus*; which is less to "be wondered at, because the most ancient Latins doubled not their "Conso-

" Consonants. Yea, the sound of this lisped R was so near that of " its neighbour S, that they writ *aSa, caSmen, papySii,* for *aRa,* " *caRmen, papyRii*; and we find the termination *oS,* as well as *oR,* " in good writers still, particularly in the prince of poets, where " *arboS* and *honoS* frequently occur; and *laboS* and *vapoS,* &c. in " others." He concludes his observations on R, by noting, as he expresses it, " the intercourse of this Liquid with some of the " Mutes; and first with C, as in *pauCus,* from παυρος;" *pauRos* " with " D, as in *coRium* from κωδιον;" *koDion,* " *meRidies,* from *meDidies,* " *querqueDula* for *querqueRula,* from *querqueRus.* Anciently also " *aR* in many words was used for *aD,* as in *aRlabi, aRfinis, aRversus,* " for *aDlabi,* &c. Lastly, it is used with *G,* as from αρνη," *aRne,* " comes *aGna, seRere* from *seGes.* This Letter is used by Poets in " describing Motion, Noise, Indignation or Violence. Vid. *Voss. Inst.* " *Orat.* IV. 2." Our author likewise observes, that R sometimes passes into its sister Liquids *l, m, n,* which indeed sometimes happens; but these are changes, which seldom occur, and are not felt in the regular operations of Language. In the organs of the Chinese, the attempt to sound the *R* often ends in the enunciation of *L*; and the gravity of our Merchants at Canton is said to be frequently relaxed, when the Chinese Traders commend their bargains of *Rice,* under a sound, which to an English ear does not excite the notion of a very desirable commodity.

The change of R into the series C, D, G, &c. is perpetually visible. It is from this relation between R and S, that R has become the *neighbour* of S, as R. Ainsworth expresses it, in our Alphabet. In Arabic and Persian, the Letters called Ra and Za, R and Z, are adjacent, and they differ only by a dot placed over the *Za,* as ز ر and in Hebrew, the *Resh* and the *Daleth,* R and D, differ by a small protuberance at the back of Daleth ד ר. We see too, that the R is not *Immutable* in the Inflexions of Nouns, since *arboS* becomes *arboRis*; and we know, that *muS* makes *muR-is, juS, juR-is, oS, oR-is,* &c. In the Inflexions of verbs too, we know, that *Ro* makes *SSi, STum,* as *geRo, geSSi, geSTum*; and Wachter has acknowledged with amazement the frequency of the changes between R and S; " Quam-

" vis

" vis hæc mutatio ob diversam literarum indolem pene incredibilis " sit, nihil tamen ea frequentius est in toto orbe. Nec alia reperiri " causa potest, nisi instabilis vulgi mutandi desiderium, quo fit, ut in " iisdem nunc HIRR*ire*, nunc *Sibilare* malit." If Wachter had adopted the English term HISS he would have seen, how the HIRR or the HIRSE and HISS might belong to each other. In Greek, we know, a double RR is oftentimes represented by RS, as *ta*RR*os*, *ta*RS*os*, (Ταρρος, Ταρσος,) an instance, produced by Wachter, *a*RR*en*, *a*RS*en*, (Αρρην, Αρσην,) &c. &c. This organical relation between R and S, &c. is an additional reason, why the S, &c. or the class C, D, &c. should be an appendage to the R, and why the forms ^R and ^R}C, D, &c. should be so perpetually connected with each other in the same series of words. We see, that another reason operates in making the series C, D, &c. an appendage to the ^R, in addition to that, by which the B, &c. becomes an appendage to the same Letter. The S, &c. may be considered as an appendage to the ^R at once by organical relation and organical accident; and the B, &c. may be regarded as an appendage by organical accident only.

This close union between the ^R and the class C, D, &c. has induced me to examine in the same Volume, the Race of Words, in which R appears as the first Consonant, and those, which belong to the form ^C, D, &c., where the R does not appear, but where the Letters belonging to the Class C, D, &c. appear alone, or combined with each other, as the Radical Consonants, with a vowel breathing preceding. We may conceive, moreover, another process, by which the ^RC *rC*, &c. and ^C, &c. become connected with each other. When the *r* in the form ^*r*C, &c. is not enunciated with some force, but is sounded in the soft manner described by R. Ainsworth, the *r* disappears, and the form ^C, &c. presents itself. The pronunciation of the *r* in many organs may be considered only as the preceding vowel sound lengthened, or sometimes as producing little or no effect; and we might safely represent such a sound by vowels, as in *Border*, *Order*, *Recorder*, *Mustard*, *Former*, *Farmer*, *Corn*, *Eastern*, *Short*, which might be written *Bawder*, *Auder*, *Recauder*, *Mustad*, *Faumer*, *Faamer*, *Cauen*, *Easten*, *Shawt*, &c. Though these reasons have induced

induced me to consider the form ^C, ^D, &c. in the same Volume with R, ^R}c, D, &c.; yet still, under one point of view, the forms may be considered perfectly distinct from each other. The points of union between the two forms are only occasionally visible, so as to become necessary objects of observation and discussion; and the form ^C, ^D, ^G, &c. may be justly considered as a separate Radical, generating by its own powers, if I may so say, a Race of words peculiar to itself. The Reader, if he pleases, may consider this hypothesis of the union of ^R with ^C, D, &c. as a *modus concipiendi*, which may be perfectly true indeed, and which will account for the relation of certain terms under the forms ^R, ^R}c, D, &c. and ^C, ^D, &c., but which, whether it be true or false, does not at all influence the various facts, relating to the affinity between the words under the form ^C, ^D, &c. itself. I must again impress on the mind of the Reader, that no detail can adequately describe these various shades of Affinity and Separation existing between different Races of words, which may be intimately related to each other at certain points of union; and it is necessary, that the nature of the truth should be communicated to the understanding by an actual review of the examples themselves, as they appear with their various bearings in the mechanism of Human Speech.

The last Letter, which remains to be considered of the third Class, is N. This Letter unequivocally connects itself with the C, D, G, &c., though it may be considered, when once existing as a Letter of its own power, and generating a Race of words, peculiar to itself. The relation between N and the Class C, D, G, &c. is allowed by Grammarians, and is visible in every Language. The Greeks, as we all know, expressed sometimes the force of *N* or of NG, by the G, or GG; that is, the G before G, K, C*h*, X, (γ, κ, χ, ξ,) had the power of of *N*, which commonly appears in other Languages, as *a*GG*elos*, (Αγγελος,) *a*NG*elus*, *o*GK*e*, (Ογκη,) *a*NG*ulus*, *u*NC*us*, *e*GC*helus*, (Εγχελυς,) *a*NG*uilla*, *laru*GX, *laru*GG*os*, (Λαρυγξ, λαρυγγος,) *lary*NX. The Grammarians or Philologists, who have written on the Greek Imparisyllabic Declension, have not failed to exhibit this union

union of *N* with S. Thus, as they have observed, what was *horteSios*, (Ορτεσιος,) in Greek, became *horteNSius*, in Latin, and in some Manuscripts, *theSauri* and *quotieS* are written *theNSauri*, and *quotieNS*. In the Latin verbs we have different forms, as *sci*N*Do*, *sci*D*i*, *fra*N*Go*, *fre*G*i*, *pi*N*Go*, *pi*N*Xi*, *pi*C*Tum*, &c. &c. In Welsh, C, G, T, D, are changed into NG, NG, NH, N, as *Car* becomes *NGar*, *Gwas* becomes *NGwas*, and *Tad*, *Duw*, are written *NHad*, *Nuw*.

In Hebrew, there is a letter called GN*ai*N, ע, and sometimes *Oin*, which different Grammarians have supposed to possess the sounds of NG, GN, NGN, G, N, or simply that of a vowel breathing O. In all this there is no difficulty; as we have only to conceive, that these various sounds are annexed to the Letter, precisely as the sounds of N and G more or less prevail in the enunciation. In French, as we know, the sound of G is perpetually annexed to the N, as *oN* is sounded *oNG*. From this connection between N and the Class C, D, &c., the following facts have arisen in the inflexions of Nouns; namely, that S, in the Nominative, sometimes becomes ^N or ^NT, in the Genitive; G and D become *GN*, DN, and N passes into NT, NK, &c., as *kteiS*, *kteN-os*, *gig-*}*aS*, *aNT-os*, *tufth*}*eiS*, *eNT-os*, *paS*, *paNT-os*, *oN*, *oNT-os*, *guNe*, *guNaiK-os*, (Κτεις, Κτενος, Γιγας, Γιγαντος, Τυφθεις, τυφθεντος, Πας, παντος, Ων, ωντος, Γυνη, γυναικος,) *saNGuiS*, *saNGuiN-is*, *oriGo*, *oriGiN-is*, *orDo*, *orDiN-is*, &c. For the same reason that we have *guNe*, *guNaiK-os*, or *guNK*, in Greek, we have *queeN*, *queaN*, *weNCh*, quasi, *gweNCh*, in English.

It will now be understood, that S in the Nominative passes into *N* in the Genitive, by a similar impulse of the mind, and by as natural a process in the organs, as that, by which S passes into T, D, &c. Those ingenious enquirers therefore, who have written on the Imparisyllabic Declension of the Greeks, have exhibited an unnecessary solicitude to discover a Nominative case, with NS, in order to correspond, as they imagine, with the Genitive in N; when that Nominative has already supplied them with an S, which is abundantly sufficient for their purpose. Thus for *kteiS*, *kteNos*, they suppose a *kteiNS*, and

and for *paS*, *paNT-os*, a *panNS*. The form NS would assuredly sometimes exist in the Nominative; that is, the sound of *N* would sometimes be as fully attached to the sound of S in the Nominative, as it is to the sound of T in the Genitive, and for the same reason. Still, however, our Philologists have no more reason for seeking out this form on all occasions, as the original and proper representation of the Nominative; than they would have for supposing, that any other Consonant, which might appear before the termination in the Genitive, had originally in all instances the same Consonant in the Nominative; as for example, that the original Nominative of *lampaS*, *lampaD-os*, *geloS*, *geloT-os*, (Λαμπας, λαμπαδος, Γελως, γελωτος,) was *lampaD*, *geloT*, or *lampaDS*, *geloTS*. The affinity, which causes the S, &c. to pass into the D or T in the Genitive, operates likewise in causing it to pass into N, though the change of S, &c. into D, T is more familiar. The fact is, that the Consonants C, D, G, &c. *constantly* and *familiarly* pass into each other; and that they are *frequently*, though not so *familiarly*, connected likewise with the Letter N.

I have applied all possible diligence to explain and define the precise point of view, under which I am desirous of representing the nature of the Cognate Consonants, and to impress most distinctly on the mind of my Reader, that this arrangement of the Letters relates *solely* to the purposes of the *Etymologist*. I have no objection, as I before stated, to the subdivisions made by Grammarians of those Consonants into lesser Classes, which I have referred to the same Class; nor to their opinion, that the Letters in each of these Classes are more particularly attached to a certain organ, and more intimately related to each other. I have no objection to any of those various modes of classification and nomenclature, which the Grammarians have been pleased to adopt in their arrangement of the Consonants; in which we hear of *Gutturals*, *Linguals*, *Palatines*, *Dentals*, *Labials*, *Doubles*, *Liquids*, *Mutes*, of three kinds, *Aspiratæ* *Tenues*, *Mediæ*, a Letter of its own right or power, *proprii juris* or *suæ potestatis*, an *Anonymous* Letter, *Cognates*, *Commutables* or *Antistoichæ*, *Solar* Letters, *Lunar* Letters, &c. &c.

I do not object to these divisions or these names, which may in different degrees, under some corrections and restrictions, be sufficiently true, and applicable to the purposes, for which they were adopted. I can have no objection even to the Anatomical discussions, which are to be found in some writers, who have exhibited the various parts in the organs of Speech, by which each Letter is enunciated. All such matters I shall leave to be investigated by those, who from their various views of considering the question may be interested in any of these enquiries. I have purposely abstained from such disquisitions, as altogether remote from the object of my pursuit, and have confined myself to those topics only, which are important to the Etymologist in the exercise of his Art. I have defined by an appeal to fact, the *Cognate* or *Commutable* Consonants; that is, those Consonants, which familiarly pass into each other, in representing the same train of ideas. With this fact only is the Etymologist concerned, which remains the same; whatever may be the cause, by which it is produced. The point, which I maintain, is simply this, that those Consonants, which I have arranged in the same Class, as *Cognate*, are *all* found to pass so *constantly* and *familiarly* into each other, whatever may be the precise mode, by which the process of change is effected; that any division of these Consonants, into separate Classes, as forming separate Races of words, is not only entirely foreign from the object of the Etymologist; but is even altogether subversive of those principles, by which alone he is enabled to perform the functions of an Artist.

If any of my Readers, whose minds should be strongly impressed with the ancient division of Consonants into different Classes considered as of the same organ, should perchance object to the use of the term *Cognate*, as applied to *all* these Consonants; I have only to observe, that I adopt this term in the same sense, which my predecessors have applied to it, when they refer to a fact, attached to these Consonants; in the familiar operations of Language. The Grammarians have applied the term *Cognate* as synonymous to *Commutable*; and I have adopted the same term in the same sense, referring only to the fact produced, and little solicitous about the cause. That is,

I have

I have not adopted the term *Cognate* for the purpose of maintaining any hypothesis about the degrees of *Affinity* between the Letters so called, as about a point at all connected with the truth of my argument, or the mode of supporting it. I conceive indeed, as others have done, in their divisions, that these Consonants have been thus *Commutable*, because they are *Cognate*, or have an *Affinity*, in various degrees and modes with each other; but the fact of their being *Commutable* into each other is that alone, to which I appeal, nor shall I entangle myself in the idle attempt to adjust the process of change, by which this property of Commutability has effected its purposes. In our familiar School Grammars no direct definition of *Cognate* is given, but the sense which has been annexed to it is manifest from the explanation subjoined to the name of certain Letters, which are called *Immutable*, Immutabiles, "Quæ *non* Literas "*Antistoichas* vel *Cognatas*, *quibus ipsæ mutentur* in verborum et "nominum inflexionibus, habent." From hence it is plain, that the *Cognate* Letters, or the *Antistoichæ*, are conceived to be those, which are *Commutable* into others. In Busby's *Metrical Grammar* we find aptly described in a single line both the cause and the effect—*Cognation* and *Commutation*.

"Has ΑΝΤΙΣΤΟΙΧΟΥΣ in se *Cognatio* transfert."

I have adopted therefore the ordinary phraseology, which I found annexed to the subject; and I differ only from the Grammarians by shewing, that, according to their own idea of *Cognate* Letters, as *Commutable* into each other in the inflexions of verbs and nouns, the number of these Letters should be increased by uniting Classes, which were before separated.

This fact, which I have exhibited respecting the *General Affinity*, between all those Letters, called *Cognate*, as it appears in their *Commutability*, confounds none of those distinctions, which are necessary for the purposes of Language; but on the contrary it is one of the great operative causes, by which these distinctions are produced and preserved. This *general Affinity* between different Classes neither disturbs the more particular relations existing in those Classes; nor does it destroy the characteristic difference, by which each Letter is distinguished

distinguished from another; any more than a similar opinion of the Etymologists, respecting the affinity of Letters in a certain Class, confounds the difference between the Letters composing that Class. Though we alike maintain the Affinity between certain Letters, we still acknowledge their difference, and understand the important effects produced by that difference. The phraseology, which we adopt to express the property of Letters, is similar to that; which is applied to the purposes of Life. When we describe the Affinity between animals, it is not understood, that those animals are confounded with each other, as if they were the same animals; but that they are different and distinct individuals of the same kind or species, connected with each other by certain bonds of resemblance or relation. From the difference between such Letters is derived a great source of variety, which is displayed in the formation of different words, conveying different senses, under some common fundamental idea, in the same Language; or in the propagation of what may be called the same words, in different Languages or Dialects. It is in fact to this principle of *Affinity* between certain Consonants, that we owe the effects of *variety* and *difference*, which those Letters have produced; since from this Affinity it has arisen, that such Consonants have readily and familiarly passed into each other, and therefore, that these differences have been exhibited. The Vowels co-operate with the *Cognate* Consonants, in producing difference and variety; but here the power of the Vowels is at once bounded; while the *Cognate Consonants* extend their influence through a wider sphere of action, in producing the same *difference* and *variety*, under the operation of that very quality, by which at the same time they preserve—propagate and record the various relations of *Similitude* and *Affinity*.

It is marvellous to observe, how the separation of the Consonants C, D, G, &c. into distinct Classes, has confounded and embarrassed all the efforts of the Etymologist in the prosecution of his Art. The very attempt to distinguish one Class from another seems to have formed an insurmountable barrier to his enquiries; though every Etymologist has expressly stated, that these Classes pass into each other, and has in reality tacitly allowed the operation of the principle

principle in its fullest extent; as he could not indeed proceed a step in the exercise of his Art, without acknowledging so manifest a fact perpetually recurring in the most ordinary and familiar examples, which passed under his view. Nothing new is advanced in this enquiry, respecting the Consonants C, D, G, &c., but the direct, plain and explicit declaration of the Principle, that they all regularly and familiarly pass into each other, to the exclusion of the rest, and that any separation of them into different classes, however just it may be under some points of view, serves only to blind and pervert the understanding in the researches of Etymology. There is nothing new likewise in my idea respecting the Vowels, that they *all* pass familiarly and promiscuously into each other, without any laws of exclusion or distinction; and moreover, that they afford no records of affinity, but the plain and explicit mode, in which this fact has been declared, and the purposes, to which a truth, thus unequivocally stated, as an indispensable Principle in the Art, is afterwards applied. The artifice likewise, which I have adopted, of removing the Vowels entirely from the view, and representing a series of words belonging to each other by Consonants only, is of singular efficacy and importance in impressing this fact on the mind of my Reader.

The Etymologists in their details of the changes of Vowels into each other, have in fact shewn, that they all pass promiscuously into each other; and therefore, that no such distinction exists; and in producing the parallel terms, whose affinity they acknowledge, where *all* the Vowels have been adopted; they tacitly allow, that the Vowels afford no record to determine the affinity of those words, as distinguished from other Words. They at the same time tacitly acknowledge, that the Consonants alone afford this record; and thus nothing is new in my conception, that the *Consonants* are the *Essential* and *Elementary* parts of Words, but the express mode, in which this Principle has been declared, and the comprehensive manner, in which it has been applied. All the Etymologists do in fact, I must again repeat, tacitly acknowledge it; and even some hardy Theorists have, from time to time, ventured to assert, that *Consonants* were the *Radical* parts of Words. Still, however, nothing has been accomplished

on

on this foundation. The Principle has been applied to no purposes of a general nature; nor has it afforded the basis of a regular System, illustrated and confirmed by a series of examples. That part of my hypothesis however may be considered as *perfectly new*, which the Reader will see fully unfolded in the present Dissertation, and established in the succeeding body of my Work; namely, that Languages have been derived or have received their force from certain names, under different Elements, denoting the EARTH, *Ground*, &c., and the operations attached to it. On the whole, I might venture to affirm, that this idea, unfolded as it is by a *new mode* of applying principles, which were before inadequately conceived, may be considered as affording to the subject of Etymology an *Art altogether new*, and totally unlike in its form and purposes, to every other mode, which has ever been adopted in discovering the Affinity of Words.

The observations which Skinner has made on the nature of the Vowels and Consonants will sufficiently point out the mode, in which other Etymologists have considered the subject. On the Vowels he observes, "*Vocales omnes* in omnibus Linguis *facile invicem commutantur*, "hæ autem illis arctiori affinitatis vinculo, saltem apud aliquas gentes, "conjunctæ videntur, ut A cum O; præsertim in Linguâ Teutonicâ, "U cum O; præsertim in Linguâ Latinâ, et vocibus Latinis in Italicam Linguam commigrantibus, E in A, saltem sono, idque perpetuo "in vocibus Franco-Gallicis, ubi sc. E. præcedit N. Consonam, ut in "*Commencer*, *Agencer*, &c. quæ ut A plenum efferuntur." After this declaration, that *all the Vowels in all Languages are easily changed into each other*, it would seem to be an idle task to unfold in separate articles, the properties of each Vowel, from which only we learn, that every Vowel passes into all the rest. Skinner, however, has bestowed six Folio pages to shew into what Vowels A has been changed, or, in other words, to shew, that it has passed into all the others, with their various combinations. He has bestowed likewise seven folio pages to prove the same thing respecting the Vowel E. Though the pale of separation has in fact been completely removed by the declaration, that all the Vowels in all Languages are easily changed into each other; yet it is marvellous to observe, how the barrier

barrier is again erected by this laborious detail of the examples; which, though it actually establishes the fact by an abundant display of proofs, seems to produce a contrary effect on the mind of the Reader, and to leave an impression on his understanding, that the Vowels are still invested with the properties of distinction.

On the *Consonants* Skinner observes, "Consonantes ferè omnes "sibi in hâc vel aliâ Linguâ aliquando cedunt, hæ autem longe "rarius quam illæ: quædam in omnibus, quædam tantùm in hâc vel "illâ Linguâ bellum quasi implacabile inter se gerunt. Cognatæ "maxime sunt B et V consona, B et F, F et V consona, V consona et "W, D et T, B et V præsertim in vocibus Teutonicis, C seu K et G, "N et L, S et T, Digamma Æolicum F et V consona, J consona et G, "Z et T, præsertim in Dialectis Teutonicâ et Belgicâ. Reliquæ cæte- "rarum consonantium permutationes minus proclives et rariores sunt, "interdum tamen occurrunt, idque manifestius, quam ut à viro "cordato rejici possint." If we learn little from this arrangement, we learn still less from the detail of the changes of each Consonant. The letter B, as he tells us, is changed in D, F, G, J, M, P, R, V, &c. The letter C into CK, F, G, H, J, K, P, Q*u*, S, T, T*ch*, V, X, Z, &c., and D is changed, as he informs us, into B, C*h*, G, L, N, P, R, S, T, V, X, Z, &c. It will not be necessary, I imagine, to proceed further in the detail of these changes, as we can only learn from hence, that *all* the Consonants pass into each other. Thus the Reader will perceive in considering this detail made by the Etymologists of the changes of each Consonant into all the rest, that I differ from them, not by enlarging the former limits of change, but by contracting them within a sphere, more bounded, distinct, and defined. We perceive moreover, that in these two modes of arrangement, the Etymologists have fallen into opposite errors, most destructive to their Art. By dividing into separate classes certain Consonants related to each other, they have destroyed the comprehensiveness of their principles, and secluded from their Art all ideas respecting that wide Affinity, which exists between extensive Families and Races of Words. In their second arrangement, when they detail to us, how *all* the Consonants pass into each other, they have destroyed the foundation of their Art by

by confounding all distinctions, and obliterating thereby those records of Affinity, by which Words are recognised to be related to each other, as distinguished from other words. It is true indeed, as the Etymologists have stated, that all the Consonants pass into each other; but they should most carefully have distinguished those Consonants, which pass into each other regularly and constantly in the familiar operations of Language from those Consonants, which only pass into each other under certain circumstances and on certain occasions. This defect in the arrangement of the Consonants would alone render all Etymological enquiries vain and unavailing.

On every fresh view of the question we shall still more and more be lost in wonder, when we cast our eyes over the present state of Etymology; and consider, that in the conjectures of those, who profess the Art, all is caprice—confusion and uncertainty; while the Art itself, as we perceive, exhibits every appearance of constancy—regularity and uniformity. It is surely marvellous, that no arrangements have been devised, and no conclusions established, which might conduct the mind to the foundation of a Systematical Theory, when the facts, which directly lead to this point are thus gross and palpable, and virtually displayed at every instant by the Etymologist himself in the details, which he exhibits. Nay, on the contrary, it should almost seem, that the operations of the Etymologist had been so conducted; as if by a kind of instinctive impression he had even shrunk from a Principle, alone important in his enquiries, as from a position adverse to his purposes, and abhorrent to his Art. Without any clue to guide his footsteps in the great Labyrinth of Language, he has wholly surrendered up his reason to the guidance of chance; and yet in the wildest wanderings of this "erring and extravagant "spirit," which has afforded so fertile a topic to the powers of ridicule; he seems, as it were, almost cautiously and purposely to have avoided the application of such an idea as an insurmountable barrier to the progress of his enquiries. Though the Etymologist is not wholly destitute of some obscure and indistinct impressions connected with the object of his Art, yet he is still perpetually prone to the strangest aberrations of licentious conjecture, and is ever ready to refer

refer words to each other, which are totally dissimilar in form and appearance; unguided by any constant or general principle, which he had before established, but prompted only by the instant and accidental suggestion of whim and of caprice. Still, however, when the dissimilarity has arisen from a cause, which is *alone* connected with the *Principle of Uniformity*; there and there only, as it should seem, the wildness of conjecture has not ventured to interpose. The dissimilarity of words arising at once from different Vowels and from Consonants bearing a *different name* and *form*, though of the *same kind*, has ever presented before the view of the Etymologist a deep and dark veil, through which his eyes have been unable to penetrate. Thus it has happened, that Words dissimilar only in appearance have remained in our conceptions *toto cœlo* removed from each other, though that dissimilarity has arisen from the effect of two processes, by one of which nothing Etymological can be illustrated, and by the other is produced that very appearance, which is alone capable of exhibiting any criterion of Radical similarity in the affinity of kindred forms, differing from each other. The boldest among the tribes of conjecturers have rarely ventured to imagine, that any affinity existed among Words disguised by this peculiar dissimilarity; and whenever the difference arising from different *Vowels* only was the object of their meditation, they failed not to proceed with due caution in detailing the progress of these mutations, and to assure us with great solemnity, that *u* became *e* in one nation, and *i* in another.

I have thus laboured with all possible diligence to lay the foundation firm and solid, on which alone the fabric of an Etymological System can be raised and established. I have endeavoured to explain, with all due brevity and precision, those facts, which relate to the *Cognate* or *Commutable* Consonants, about whose nature and number no ideas have been yet formed, which could at all contribute to the purposes of an Art. I shall now close my remarks on this subject, as we can only understand, from a consideration of the examples themselves, the peculiar mode, in which these changes are produced and operate. If the Reader perchance, in the spirit of captious objection, should be disposed to observe, that I have assumed to myself

an ample sphere for the exercise of my Theory or my Invention; and that with such a latitude of change, transformations of every kind may readily be effected; I have only to reply, that this variety of mutation cannot justly be charged on him, who had no share in its production; and that the confusion arising from this latitude of change (if any such should be found to exist) is not the fault but the misfortune of the writer, who has ventured to pursue an intricate and embarrassed theme through all its perplexities and all its deviations. I have described only a plain, simple fact, which it was my duty faithfully to detail; and according to this fact must all my researches be minutely regulated. If we have seen, that words belonging to each other assume these various forms, and appear under these disguising garbs; it is our business precisely to ascertain the number of these varieties, and the nature of these disguises. We may lament indeed, that the forms should be so numerous, but we shall rejoice that they are still found so regular and so similar:—If we are perplexed by the difference of the garb, we shall be guided by the uniformity of the badge; and if these varying shapes should elude our search by the frequency of change, they will grow familiar to our knowledge by the constancy of recurrence.

Section II.

(1.)

The Writer having unfolded one mode of discovering the Affinity between Words; namely, that relating to their representation by symbols, in which the Vowels are rejected, and the Consonants of the same power are alone employed, proceeds in the next place to examine that other criterion of Affinity, equally indispensible, which relates to the *Fundamental idea*, pervading a Race of Words connected with each other—Certain Facts in Language are produced, referring to the practice of some nations, in representing a *Fundamental idea* by *Consonants*. In the Eastern Languages, *Hebrew—Arabic*, &c., Vowels are rejected, and Consonants only employed.—This mode of representing a *Fundamental idea* in certain Languages, under *Consonants* of the same *name* and *form* suggests to us the probability, that the same *Fundamental idea* is likewise to be found under Consonants of the same *power* or the same *Cognate* Consonants.—The most intimate affinity between the different Languages on the parts of the Globe, with which we are most conversant, is acknowledged to exist.—Hence there is some reason to conjecture, and such is the Hypothesis of the Writer, that '*Through all Languages, which this Affinity pervades, the same Element conveys the same Fundamental meaning.*

In discovering the Affinity of Words, it is necessary to shew, as I have already stated, that they appear under forms, which by the familiar operations of Language may have passed into each other, and that they contain the same fundamental idea. In the preceding Section I have fully explained the first portion of this criterion of Affinity, by unfolding the nature of those Forms, which are able to afford a record of this familiar operation. I have shewn, that the existence of the *Cognate Consonants* supplies those Forms, from which one portion of the proof may be obtained, that Words have passed into or are related to each

each other. We must now consider with great care and diligence the remaining portion of the criterion, which constitutes this fact of Affinity; namely, *the existence of the same fundamental idea.* This question involves in it a variety of considerations, which must be duly separated and arranged. As far as we have already proceeded, our principle is just and promising; yet it still remains for us to see, whether other circumstances concur with an agent, thus promising and capable of effect, in such a manner, that their union may finally produce the establishment of a System, which shall operate through a wide sphere in the developement of Human Speech.

We shall all agree, that if words pass into each other they must carry with them the *same Fundamental idea,* however various and apparently remote from each other the senses may be, which those words convey. This process of the mind, by which it passes from one sense to another, with the *same Fundamental idea,* is precisely similar to that, by which different senses are annexed to what we should all consider as the same word, or as derivatives from that word. Though this Fundamental idea, may not be discoverable by us in the different senses of what we should call the same word, yet no one will doubt, that such a Fundamental idea must necessarily exist. In a Race of Words bearing different forms, though containing the same Cognate Consonants, a similar difficulty increased by other causes of embarrassment, may be imagined to prevail; and though these words present one criterion, which is sufficient to shew us, that they *might* have passed into each other; yet we have no convincing proof, that they really *have* passed into each other, till we can ascertain, that they contain likewise the *same Fundamental idea.* This coincidence too must take place under certain circumstances, which are connected with some great and acknowledged facts in the History of Language; in order to convince us, that accident did not operate in producing such an effect. The most superficial view of Language, in its familiar operations, will shew us, that the mind is inclined to propagate different senses with the same fundamental idea, or with different turns of the same sense, by various forms of the same Elementary term. This, we know, is the artifice of Language in adopting

adopting the different parts of a Verb and Noun, under the names of *Voices—Moods—Tenses*, &c. *Cases*, &c., in forming *Derivatives—Compounds*, &c. If the Reader will cast his eyes for a moment over such words as *Ago*, *Duco*, *Traho*, in Latin, and Αγω, Βαλλω, in Greek, &c. &c., with their various acknowledged *Derivatives—Compounds*, &c., he will be astonished to see, what a prodigious variety of ideas, apparently and in fact, most remote from each other, has been engrafted upon the same stock, or has proceeded from the same fundamental notion. The dissimilitude of ideas, existing in terms related to each other, must be considered as one of the most familiar effects produced by such a process; as we know, that in the artifice of Verbs the most prominent effect is that of producing a sense or an idea, directly opposite, with the same term, as *Vinc-ere*, *Vinc-i*, *Conquer*, *Conquer-ed*, &c. &c.

These acknowledged and familiar operations of Language will shew us, that the mind would pursue the same course, as far as it is able, on other occasions, by endeavouring to produce a Race of different Words, passing into each other, under the same fundamental idea; though their forms may be so different, that with our present conceptions on Language, their Affinity may be concealed from our view. The mind, I say, as we may conceive, from what we manifestly perceive, will endeavour to effect a similar purpose in a similar way; and the Cognate Consonants, as we have seen, are capable of being employed in effecting this purpose, and are likewise able to maintain their position in recording the fact of its existence. Other causes, however, may have operated, which would place such a barrier to the propensity of the mind, and the properties of the organs, that no System of extent or importance could be formed on this fact, however ascertained and apparent it might be. Languages might have been so constituted, as to bear little or no affinity with each other; and in such a case each form of Speech might have had a System, peculiar to itself. There is another circumstance likewise of the highest importance in such a question, and this relates to the nature of the impressions, which have influenced the mind in the formation of ideas and of words. If it should have happened, that Languages

owe

owe their existence to impressions, arising from a variety of objects; the words, of which it is formed, might be considered as divided into as great a variety of Sets and Classes, which it would be difficult perhaps or impossible to arrange. In this case the propensity of the mind to pursue one fundamental idea, through a wide sphere of meaning, or to form one continued chain of ideas, by links mutually connected with each other, would be counteracted by another propensity, which consists in obeying the influence of predominating impressions, however various and discordant they may be. Under such an operation, Language might have presented to our view a state so embroiled and entangled, that no efforts of sagacity or diligence would have succeeded in attempting to unravel the difficulties, with which it was involved. If it should have happened, that some one great and important object has seized upon the mind, and has supplied Language with its ideas and its words; we shall at once understand, how favourable such a fact would be in the establishment of a System. If, moreover, it should have happened, from some cause connected with the History of the Human Race, that Languages bear the most intimate relation and affinity to each other, our hopes of forming some general System will be highly excited and enlarged. From the co-operation of both these causes every thing might be expected, and we should then be induced to believe, that the sphere of our labours would become bounded—distinct, and defined. Our researches would then appear to be employed on the study of *one* great Language—universally diffused under various forms; which was itself originally derived from *one* great object, universally apparent, and perpetually soliciting the attention of mankind. We must proceed however with care and caution in the developement of such facts, if any such are to be found; and we must commence our enquiries with the most simple and acknowledged cases, before we venture to advance to conclusions, so extensive and important.

The Vowels, as we have seen, are wholly banished from my System, in the representation of words, not only as unnecessary, but as impeding likewise to the purposes of the Etymologist; and the Consonants alone are retained, as being those parts, which are best able

able to propagate and to record a train of ideas, under some *common, fundamental notion.* Let us examine by an appeal to acknowledged and familiar facts existing in Language, if any attempts have been ever made to record ideas by Consonants only, and how far this process has actually been carried. The Reader, who perhaps on the commencement of these enquiries might have been alarmed at the hypothesis, that Vowels were unnecessary to the Art of the Etymologist, will be astonished to learn or to recollect, that they are not even necessary to convey ideas in the familiar representation of Languages, and that there are forms of Speech, and those too the most ancient and illustrious of their order, in which the Vowels are rejected. In the Eastern Languages *Consonants only* are applied, and the Vowels are either partly or wholly banished from the representation of Words. In my early meditations on this subject I had already proceeded to the conclusion, respecting the inutility of Vowels, and the importance of Consonants, before I recollected this familiar fact, so important to my purpose. It is marvellous to observe, how slowly the mind recalls to its view the most known and acknowledged truths, for the purpose of combining them with a new train of ideas; and perhaps, as I have suggested, the Reader himself may have proceeded to this point of the enquiry, under the same influence, without the smallest recollection of so familiar a fact.

When I began to engage in the study of the Eastern Languages, a new scene was opened to my view, and all my former conceptions became enlarged and confirmed. Before we proceed further in unfolding the train of ideas, connected with the study of these Languages; it is necessary to explain the precise mode, in which they have applied the Consonants, and rejected the Vowels. In the alphabet of these Eastern Languages—Hebrew, Arabic, &c. certain Vowels indeed exist, but they are of little importance in discharging regularly and familiarly those offices, which the Vowels in our own Language, and in others of a similar kind perpetually perform. The Reader will not understand, that the Hebrews and Arabs, &c. have acquired any artifice unknown to Europeans, by which they are enabled to *speak* their Language without Vowels: He will readily perceive, that this neglect

neglect of Vowels must refer only to the *writing* of Language; and we shall find no great difficulty in comprehending, that the symbols employed to denote the Vowel breathings are not absolutely necessary in the representation of a Language. Perhaps the following example will best serve to illustrate the mode, in which words are written in the Eastern Languages, with that mixture of Consonants and Vowels, which exists in their alphabet. "Ur fther whch art in avn hlwd "be th nm: th kngdm cm, th wl be dn in arth, as it is in avn: "gv-s ths dy ur dly brd, and frgv-s ur trspss, as w-forgv thm tht "trsps agnst-s, and ld-s nt int tempttn bt dlvr-s frm avl: fr thn is "th-kngdm and th-pwr and th-glry fr avr and avr." This specimen will give the Reader a very sufficient notion of the mode, in which Vowels are used and neglected in the Arabic and Hebrew Languages.

Though this is the ordinary manner, in which the Hebrews and Arabs write their Language: yet they likewise employ certain marks (which, as adopted in Hebrew, are called points,) above and below the words, to represent the Vowels, which have been omitted, and which are necessary in the enunciation. Vowels, we know, are equally necessary with Consonants in *speaking* a Language; and if we would become intelligible, we must adopt the same Vowels in expressing the same idea: but in *writing* a Language, I may venture to affirm, they are in many cases totally useless. Those, who well understand a Language, do not attach to a word, as *Father*, &c. the sounds which ought to be adopted, by a nice consideration of the force belonging to the peculiar symbols *a* and *e*, but by an immediate impression of the sense, which the whole symbol conveys to the mind. It is evident therefore, that if the symbol, as FTHR, be sufficient to excite in the understanding the exact idea, which was meant to be expressed; any attempt to represent the breathing is superfluous. Now we know, that in the Eastern Languages the Consonants are of themselves sufficient to excite this idea; and if the Reader will make the experiment on some English sentences, with which he is not conversant, written without Vowels, he will discover, that even in his first attempts to understand their meaning he has but few difficulties

to

to encounter; and he will be perfectly convinced, that with a small portion of practice no embarrassment whatever would arise from that cause.

It will instantly be seen, that the Lexicons, in explaining the various senses of a single word, as it might be called, represented without Vowels, would often exhibit a variety of senses, which on the first view might appear but little similar or related to each other: Still, however, I observed, that the Hebrew Lexicographers considered it as an important part of their task, to discover the general idea, to which these various senses might be all referred; and to detail with precision the links of the chain, by which their affinity was ascertained and preserved. I observed, that the *same* word, as the Hebrew Lexicographers would call it, in assuming these various senses, often adopted different points or Vowels; that is, according to our mode of conceiving the subject, we should say, that different words existed with different meanings, and that the same Consonants were to be found in all. We here perceive, that the presence of the same Consonants in these several words, which, in Hebrew, is thought of most importance in the question, would, according to our conceptions, be totally disregarded; or, if at all noticed, would be considered only as the effect of accident.

In contemplating this circumstance, a new scene of investigation was opened to my view. I began to reflect, that, as Man was the same creature in the East and in the West, the English Language must have arisen from the same principles of mind and organs, however modified by circumstances, which operated in the formation of the Hebrew; and that similar facts, as they are connected with these causes, would probably be found in both these Languages. It was then easy to understand, that, if the Hebrew Lexicographers had formed a true conception of their subject; a Dictionary might be written in English on the same plan, and that the same mode of investigation might likewise be adopted. I then applied for confirmation of this idea to an example in English: I examined the various senses belonging to the Word or the Radical CP, and I found, that with different points or vowels, it signified *A Species of Dress—A*

Vessel for drinking, and *A Covering for the head*, &c. &c. The forms, which it assumes in our Language, under these senses, are Cope (an ancient dress of priests)—Cup—Cap, &c. I soon perceived, that the same idea was conveyed under each of these forms; though the objects, which they expressed, discharged functions annexed to the original idea or quality, in a manner totally different and dissimilar to each other. I observed, that the fundamental sense of the Word or Radical CP, in these terms, was that of *Holding—containing—enfolding*, &c. This was a very important step in the progress of my enquiry.

On again considering the mode, which the Hebrew Lexicographers had adopted, though I still acknowledged, that it far exceeded all our conceptions on the subject; yet I soon perceived that their ideas were bounded within the most contracted limits, and that they had not even advanced beyond the threshold of the enquiry. I found, that the words, which they considered to be impregnated with the same idea, were only those, which were represented by the *same Consonants*, that is, by Consonants of the same *name* and the same *form*; and they seemed to be unconscious, that among other words there existed any species of relationship—connexion or similarity whatever. In the Hebrew Lexicographers we discover no propensities to Etymology, as it relates to the Language which they have undertaken to explain; and in this point of view, they are even inferior to their fellow-labourers in a similar employment. Without enquiring into the cause of these kindred significations being attached to the same Consonants; we well know, that it did *not* arise from the *figure* of the symbol; and therefore it is infinitely futile and unmeaning to confine the influence of this principle within a sphere of action, which has no reference to the operations of the cause. Thus if a general idea is affixed to the Radical CP, which runs through the various words in which CP is found; we are well persuaded, that the *forms* of C and P were not instrumental in producing this effect; and consequently that the same train of ideas will be equally found among words, which are expressed by KP—*Ch*P, CV, &c., SB, SP, &c. &c.

On

On examination I found this fact likewise to exist, in English and in various other Languages. Hence we have Cav*us*, Cav*o*, (Lat.) with its parallels Cave, &c. Coif (Eng.), &c.—the parallel terms to Cup, as Scyp*hus*, (Σκυφος), &c.—Ship, Skiff with their parallels passing through many Languages, as in the Teutonic Dialects Scip, Skip, Skib, &c. in Greek and Latin Skaph*e*, Skaph*os*, (Σκαφη, Σκαφος,) Scaph*a*, &c.

We are now enabled to make a very important use of the *Cognate Consonants*, whose mutations have been already ascertained. I must again repeat, what we shall instantly acknowledge, that a general idea pervading a Race of Words with the *same* Consonants, is not attached to the *name* but the *nature* of the symbol;—that it is not a necessary attendant on the *form* of the symbol, which is an arbitrary sign, perpetually changing; but it is an inseparable adjunct to the *power* and *property* of that symbol, whatever form it may assume, and by whatever name it may be called. Palpable as this fact may appear, that even its illustration borders upon ridicule; yet we know, that the Hebrew Lexicographers have had no glimpse of its existence; and they have continued to compose Dictionaries, as if among the maxims of their art it had been expressly decided, that of symbols invested with similar properties, though bearing different forms, ideas were *enamoured* with one *form*, and were abhorrent from another. This then was my conclusion. If it is accordant to the genius of the Hebrew Language, that similar ideas should be represented by the same Consonants, or by Consonants bearing the same form and name; it must certainly be true, that the *same* cognate *Consonants*, through the whole compass of the Language, will be impregnated with a train of similar ideas. As those principles of the human mind, which are effective in the production of one Language, will operate either partly or wholly in that of another, I again was led to conclude, that in every form of Speech the same fact will probably exist. I again referred to the English, Latin, and Greek Languages for the confirmation of this idea; and I found the most ample proofs for the establishment of my hypothesis, which the reader will see detailed in the succeeding discussions.

We

We have now advanced far in our project, of generalizing the doctrine of Languages. Our scheme, as it relates to different forms of Speech separately considered, is fair and promising; and our purpose appears to be obtained, with as much evidence and prospect of effect, as can be expected in a detail, which relates only to the foundation of an Hypothesis. We have seen by a train of reasoning, which has been conducted on a consideration of some acknowledged facts in the construction of certain forms of Speech, that in each Language the *same fundamental idea* is probably conveyed by the same Cognate Consonants. There remains but one step more to the completion of our Theory; as it relates to the representation of ideas by these *Cognate Consonants*. The point, which now remains, is to determine, through how wide a sphere of action this power of the Cognate Consonants is extended. That it is extended beyond each particular Language, all will allow, who suppose that any one Language, or Dialect, bears any resemblance to another. Here again it is difficult to speak with precision; as, in extending our views, we shall be involved in the intricacies of adjusting the various degrees of affinity, which different forms of speech may be supposed to bear to each other. Languages have been divided into various Sets and Classes, with sufficient truth and reason; as the Dialects of the Teutonic—the Celtic Dialects—the Dialects of the Sclavonic—the Dialects of the Chaldee or Hebrew, &c. Now all agree, that in the Dialects or Languages belonging to each Class the most intimate union prevails; so that in the general course of these Languages, the words, which they contain, would be considered to be the *same*, under some difference of form and some variety of meaning. It has ever been the business of Etymologists to endeavour to collect these *same* words, if I may so say, under their various forms, and to exhibit them to their readers, under the name of *Parallel* terms.

It is marvellous to observe, how fully and unequivocally the *general affinity of Languages* has been acknowledged by all our writers under the names of Etymologists, Philologists, &c. &c., in their various modes of considering the question; and yet how little they have understood of the extent or nature of that Affinity, which they labour

labour with such diligence to discover and illustrate. It might perhaps conduct the mind by a shorter process to a more precise idea of the nature of that Affinity, which pervades the forms of Human Speech; if we should briefly describe the state of the question, as it is pursued by the Enquirers into Language. The Etymologists, when the object of their research relates to the *same* word, as they would call it; or to words, under various forms, bearing precisely the *same* sense, as FATHER, PATER, &c. have performed their duty with sufficient diligence and skill. They endeavour to collect all the words, bearing the *same* sense, which appear under the same *Cognate Consonants* such as they are before described. Though the Etymologists perform this task, under an obscure and undefined impression of the nature of these Consonants; still they do it; nor have they in fact any other criterion of the identity of the word, than such as I have explained to be the true one, namely, the existence of the same Fundamental idea, and of the same Cognate Consonants. Beyond this point however all is total darkness, and the obscure impression, by which they were before guided, either avails them no more, or it involves them in the mazes of error and confusion. They commonly proceed no further in their view of kindred words, than the production of those terms, which contain precisely the *same* idea. Of the same *Fundamental* idea, under different turns of meaning, they have formed no conception. When kindred words present themselves to the Etymologist, in the familiar exercise of his art, marked, as it should seem, with the most unequivocal traits of a common origin, every idea of Affinity is lost to his view; if these words exhibit any *difference* in the turns of meaning which they convey; even though this difference is precisely of the same kind, as that, to which he has been perpetually witness in the different senses, annexed to a single word. Here every vestige of Affinity totally vanishes; and under this conception even the same Language does not appear to the view of the Etymologist as at all connected with itself. When I speak of such a mode, as adopted by the Etymologists in their consideration of the question; I must be supposed to mean, that this is the usual and familiar mode, in which the subject is considered.—

The

The Etymologist is indeed often liable, as I have before stated, to the wildest aberrations; in which he refers words, to each other, totally remote in meaning as in form. This however is only another practice, proceeding from a similar misconception on the nature of Languages.

It should seem, as if in the theory of the Etymologist, all the Relations of Language were loose, capricious and accidental; while in their ordinary and familiar operations they are in truth all compact, constant and necessary. Though the Etymologist sees, (I must again repeat,) an *Affinity* between Languages, almost to an *unbounded* extent, in *innumerable* instances; when he details words, passing through a vast compass of Human Speech, which convey precisely the *same* idea; yet this striking and acknowledged affinity produces, in his conception, no consequences whatever, either in the general relations of each particular Language or in the general relations of the whole mass of Languages. We might imagine from this view of the question that he conceived these innumerable instances of Affinity, as exemplified only in the existence of various insulated sets or strings of words, if I may so express it, passing through different Languages, to be merely the effects of accident. This however is not so; since most Etymologists consider the Affinities of Language, as produced from some regular cause; though indeed they suppose that cause to operate under a certain process, which no regular cause ever did or could produce. There are however some Etymologists, and those too, who have passed their lives in the enquiry, who appear to imagine that all the Affinities beyond the Kindred Dialects have been the effects of *Accident*, and when they discover Teutonic words, for example, existing in the Eastern Dialects &c., they communicate this fact to the reader, with some marks of astonishment, under the designation of the *Strange*—the *Curious*, or the *Whimsical Coincidence*.—Whatever opinion may be entertained by the Etymologists, as to the cause, by which affinities in Language are produced; it should seem, as if they all agreed as to the *direction*, in which those affinities proceeded: It should appear, as if the Enquirers into Languages imagined that these Affinities acted only in a *straight line*, generally passing though different Kindred Dialects

Dialects, and sometimes stretching through the whole sphere of Human Speech, without any property or power of admitting or communicating collateral relations. I know not, in what terms, I can most impressively convey to the mind of my reader these strange and perverse conceptions, which the Enquirers into Languages have formed on the mode of its operation. It is important however, that these delusions should be fully exhibited, and that all preconceived notions, derived from this source, should be removed from the understanding.

We may illustrate these general observations, by an appeal to some examples in the following manner. The Etymologists produce, as we know, the parallel terms to FATHER, as PATER, VATER, &c.—to MOTHER as MATER, MUTTER, &c. and to EARTH, as ERDE, &c. through a wide compass of Human Speech, by which the closest affinity between the Languages, in which these words exist, seems to be proved. Yet this affinity, according to their conceptions, makes no progress collaterally, if I may so say, either in the individual Language, in which each word occurs, or in the other Languages. MOTHER is supposed to stand *alone* in English—MATER in Latin, &c. &c., except in the acknowledged and palpable derivatives *Motherly, Maternus,* &c., nor are there any other words, in any of these Languages, to which it is supposed to bear any relation.—That is, if MOTHER with its parallels MATER be considered as one word; then we may affirm, that according to the present opinion MOTHER stands absolutely *alone* in Language—an *insulated—solitary* term, without any relation to any series of terms, in the world of words, with which it is surrounded. The Reader is not to understand, as I before suggested, that the Etymologists have not *derived,* as they call it, the term MATER from certain other *single* terms, existing in Language, according to their different ideas. But all this proceeds upon the same principle of the same *solitary* process; according to which it is supposed, that every word either stands *alone,* or has only *one* other word in Language, to which it bears any relation. In short, the Etymologists have no conception, that *Mother* or *Mater* belongs to any *class* or body of words, in any of the Languages, through which it passes. This is the point which I mean to urge,

and

and which is most strictly true, in the fullest extent, according to the force and spirit of the observation.

Our Etymologists have discovered likewise, that the word EARTH is to be found in a great variety of Languages, as in the Gothic, Saxon, German, English, Belgic, Danish, Swedish, Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Egyptian, and Greek, as AIRTHA, EARD, EORD, EORTHE, ERDA, HERDA, EARTH, AARD, j-ORD, EREZ, ARTHA, ARTHO, ERTOSI, Ερα, ERA, as they are produced by Wachter.—Yet even this great Etymologist, when he records the terms not in the Teutonic Dialects, seems to think that they can scarcely be considered, as belonging to the same series, by faintly observing; "*Conveniunt* sono "et significatu."—Important as the object is, conveyed by these words, or by this word, if we consider the above forms, as constituting one and the same term; and however we might be disposed to conjecture *à priori*, that this word would be allied to other terms, in the Languages through which it passes; yet I may safely and confidently affirm, under the trivial exceptions before suggested, that this word is considered as standing absolutely *solitary* and *alone* in the formation of Language. One instance only occurs to me, in which our English Etymologists have made the least attempt to refer any term to our word EARTH, and even in this instance it is done only obliquely. This instance is *Hearth*, under which Junius and Skinner record the German *Hertha* and *Herthus*, which they acknowledge on another occasion to belong to EARTH; and Skinner suggests with the adverb of doubt their relation to ERA (Ερα.) "*Fort.* omnia à Gr. "Ερα, Terra, Ενερθε Νερθε." I might be able perhaps to produce another instance or two among the Etymologists in other Languages, where something of this sort has taken place; which only serves to confirm the position already advanced.

It is assuredly most marvellous, that the mind, contemplating only this single fact of the parallel terms to the EARTH, should not be led into a train of ideas, which would open into a wide view of the formation of Languages. We might have imagined, that such would have been the train of ideas, excited by the consideration of this fact. Is it possible, we should say, that a Word expressing an object, so important

as

'as ERA, (Ερα,) EARTH, &c. should have no terms in Language to 'which it is allied? Is it possible, that such a Word should stand 'absolutely *solitary* and *alone*, in all the Languages, through which it 'passes? Are there no terms, connected with it, which relate to the 'operations performed on its surface, as *Ploughing—Digging*, &c.? 'It is impossible surely, but that such terms must exist; and if they 'do exist, how are they to be discovered?—Why, they must be dis-'covered from the same principle, on which alone it can be allowed, 'that the various forms for the word EARTH belong to each other. 'On what principle do we allow that the forms ERA, (Ερα,) 'EARTH, &c. belong to each other? On this principle, namely, that 'under all these different forms the same Elementary Consonant R 'is found sometimes standing alone, and sometimes with the addition 'of the *same Cognate* Consonants, and that the same idea is con-'veyed.—If these different forms then constitute the same word, or 'if these words all belong to each other, what shall we say about the 'different Vowels, employed in expressing them? Why we must 'say, that they mean nothing in determining the affinity of words; 'for if the existence of different Vowels is allowed to form an im-'pediment to the fact of affinity between words, the terms EARTH, 'AIRTHA, &c., cannot be said to belong to each other, which we 'acknowledge to be the fact. Here we see, the words, belonging to 'each other, convey *precisely* the *same* idea. Is it necessary however, 'that this should always be the fact in words, belonging to each 'other, which may be connected with the EARTH, &c.? Certainly 'not: On the contrary, the familiar artifice in Language in the for-'mation of acknowledged *Derivatives—Compounds*, &c. exists for 'a purpose directly contrary, namely, that the words related to each 'other, may have a *different* meaning, and perform thereby a *different* 'purpose, though still under the *same Fundamental notion*.—Nay such 'is the propensity of the mind to form different senses from the same 'stock, that even the very *same* word, as we know, passes into a great 'variety of senses, though all proceeding on the same common idea.— 'We should conclude then, that a similar fact will take place in words, 'connected with EARTH, &c., namely, that certain words will be

'found, which are connected with EARTH, conveying the *same* 'Fundamental notion, though expressing different senses, as it might 'be, those of *Ploughing—Turning up the Ground*—HARROWING, &c., 'which are to be recognised by the existence of the Elementary R, either 'alone or with the addition of the *Cognate Consonants*, T, D, S, &c.— 'without any regard to the Vowels adopted in expressing such words.' Nothing, as we should have imagined, could have been more obvious—direct and satisfactory than this mode of reasoning, by which we should be at once admitted into a view of the subject, most inlarged and important.

In the examples above produced, as they are represented by Wachter, we have only the D, T, S and Z introduced as the *Cognate Consonants*; but we must observe, that the Chaldee and Samaritan terms, intended by this writer, ארץ ארק, are sometimes represented by ARK, and ARG, where the K and G are to be added as Cognate Consonants to the T, D, &c.; and thus we are brought to the arrangement of the Consonants, such as I have described them in the preceding pages. We now perceive, that the Race of words allied to ERA, (Ερα,) EARTH, &c. will be found under forms, which in an abstract way may be represented by ^R, ^R}c, D, &c. All, I think, will allow, that a Race of words, connected with each other, and belonging to ERA, (Ερα,) EARTH, &c. must assuredly exist, and that terms, expressing so important an object, cannot stand alone in Language, or be attended only by one or two solitary examples of Affinity. So completely however is the term ERA, (Ερα,) insulated in the conception of those, who detail to us the affinities of Greek words with each other, that in glancing my eye over the part of Martinius, which relates to that subject, I do not find any Greek word, belonging to the Element ^R, which has been referred to this term, except ARΟΟ, (Αροω, Aro.) Even the words, beginning with EP are not perceived to have any relation to EPα; and if no Affinity of this kind should be suspected, we may well imagine, in what total darkness all other words are involved, which belong to the same Radical.

I am desirous of impressing in the strongest manner on the mind of my Reader, that all the words, of which Human Speech is composed, are

are in general considered as *solitary* and *insulated;* nay, what is more curious, we even find, that this conception is most prevailing and predominant, with respect to each individual Language. Words are perpetually referred to single—solitary words in *other* Languages; but it seldom happens, that a word is ever referred to another word in its *own* Language, when these words have assumed any difference of form from different Vowels, &c., or when they are *spelt* differently, as we are wont to call it. I cannot adopt a term, which so aptly conveys my meaning, or which gives us so just an idea of the feeble conceptions, on which the Art of Etymology has been hitherto pursued. This *spelling* of Words, as it is called, has alike confounded the understandings of the youngest and oldest of our scholars. It should seem almost, as if a maxim had prevailed in the Art of Etymology, that no two words could belong to each other in the *same* Language, which were *spelt* differently, though they might in different Languages; and thus it happened, that in the conception of the Etymologist, words directly adjacent to each other in the order of his Vocabulary, which differed only by the minutest variety of form and meaning, were *toto cœlo* removed from each other, as creatures of another world, and another system. Nay, even when the words happened to bear precisely the same form, if there existed the smallest difference in their turn of meaning, no affinity is perceived; though the greatest difference of form and meaning sometimes afforded no impediment to affinity, when a different Language was concerned. Thus Skinner perceives no relation between BALK, the lengthened ridge of the Furrow, and BALK, a Beam; though he observes, that if he were *sufficiently Critical,* (Si satis Criticus essem,) he might derive BALK, the ridge, from the Latin *Porca,* though he prefers the Italian *Valicare,* Vado transire, which he derives from *Varca* or *Barca.* According to this conception we see, that each Language has of all other Languages the least affinity with itself; and that the words, of which it is composed, if they are desirous of finding companions, must seek for them in foreign parts and distant regions. I beseech the Reader to cast his eyes for a single hour only over the *Etymologicons* or the Dictionaries of any Languages, in which the opinions of their composers

posers can be gathered, and he will at once see in what a compleat state of *Insulation* every word in each Language is placed. All the words under any two Consonants of the same form and name, as BC, &c., which in the Eastern Languages would constitute the same word, are considered as totally separated from each other in the Teutonic Dialects—Greek—Latin, &c.; thus it is, under BD, BF, BG, &c. through the whole compass of each form of Speech.

In the Vocabularies of the Greek Language this insulated state of words will be most visible, as here their composers have exhibited their own ideas, even without the assistance of explanation, by printing their separate Radicals in capital Letters. I cannot forbear illustrating in a few sentences the observations, which I have just made, that we may be enabled to have some glimpse of the process, by which words are connected with each other. The term BALLO, (Βαλλω, Ferio, figo, saucio, attingo, projicio, emitto, profundo, pono, immitto, trado, committo, condo, ædifico, verro, flecto,) bears, we know, itself many different senses, and has been applied through its Compounds and Derivatives to a great variety of meanings and purposes. Yet even this word stands alone amidst all the terms under the form BL, in the arrangements of the Lexicographer, and almost in the opinion of the Etymologist, if we except a miserable conjecture or two made by Martinius, &c. We find BALLO, BEELOS, BOULE, BOULOMAI, BOOLOS, (Βαλλω, Jacio, Βηλος, Limen domus vel templi quod calcatur, Βουλη, Consilium, Βουλομαι, Volo, Βωλος, Gleba, ager, massa, Bolus,) all placed as Radicals by the ordinary Lexicographers; and Martinius sees no connection between these words, except in Βουλη and Βουλομαι. We shall now, I think, at once agree, that they all belong to each other. We shall perceive, that BALLO, (Βαλλω, Jacio,) is the verb of which BOOLOS, (Βωλος, Gleba,) is the substantive, and that it relates to the action of *Stirring up* or *Casting up* the *Dirt*. We shall likewise perceive, that BEELOS, (Βηλος,) is the place in which the *Dirt* is *Thrown about—Stirred up*, &c. by the feet, &c. We shall see too, that the sense of Counsel, BOULE, BOULEUO, (Βουλη, Βουλευω, Consulto, delibero, *Consilia Agito*,) is derived from the familiar metaphor of *Stirring up* or *about a surface*,

face, as in the phrases ‘ *Consilia Agito,* To *Turn* matters over in the ‘ mind, To *Revolve, Volvere* consilia ;’ and that Boulomai, (Βουλομαι, Volo,) the term of *Desiring—Craving* or *Searching* after or for any thing, belongs to the same action of *Routing into* or *up* a Surface; just as *Scrutor,* To Seek, belongs to *Scruta,* Rubbish, *Scruta Eruere,* and as *Solicito,* which means ‘ To *Solicit* or Desire any thing earnestly’ belongs to *Solum* and *Cito,* “ To Stir or Dig up, properly the Ground,” says R. Ainsworth. This union between Bouleuo, (Βουλευω,) and Ballo, (Βαλλω,) is entirely hidden, even though the latter has precisely the same meaning, of which that popular Lexicographer Benjamin Hederic has produced no less than five examples, “ Βαλλειν “ εν θυμω seu εν φρεσι, Cogitare; Βαλλεσθ’ εις νουν, animum adver- “ tere; εφ’ εαυτου, apud se cogitare; τι ες θυμον.” We now see, that Volo attaches itself to Volvo for the same reason as Boulomai does to Bouleuo; and that all of them belong to each other. The Etymologists see no relation between Volvo and Volo, To be willing, though they understand, that Volo and Boulomai, (Βουλομαι,) belong to each other. Yet though Volo, To be willing, and Volvo are totally removed in their eyes from every degree of affinity, yet one conjecturer has supposed, that Volvo may belong to Volare, To fly. Some have moreover conjectured, that Volvo may belong to Poleo, (Πολεω, Verso, circumago,) which is indeed right, though remote. We know, that Poleo, (Πολεω, Aro,) means to *Plough*; and Meric Casaubon has seen, that these words may belong to each other, in which likewise he is right. No one however has seen, that Poleo, (Πολεω,) has any connection with Pelos, (Πηλος, Lutum.) All agree, that to Volvo are attached Voluto, “ To *Roll,* to *Wallow,* “ to toss,” and *Volumen,* a *Volume*; and thus we see, that the book or Volume, from which the Reader is enabled to understand these truths, is connected with the action of *Rolling* or *Wallowing* in the *Dirt.* Voluptas is acknowledged to belong to Volo, To be willing, and so it does; but we see, that it is connected likewise with Volvo and with the metaphor of Wallow*ing* in *Sensuality.* Though the Etymologists see no connection between Volvo and Volo, To *Will,* its fellow term; yet they carry us into other forms of Speech, and

compare

compare Volvo with the Greek Eilco and Kulio, (Ειλεω, conglobo, Κυλιω, Volvo.) Though nothing can be more remote under their conceptions of Language than these terms, yet still they have justly conjectured. We see, how all this accords with the observations, which have before been made on the affinity of the Elementary forms C, &c. B, &c. } L } c, &c. b, &c.; and let us mark in Globo another form of Volvo, as I have shewn in the representation GU } L } b, &c.

It has been seen, that Wallow belongs to Volvo, and Will to Volo and Boulomai, (Βουλομαι.) We shall perceive, how the Balk of Land and the Beam is connected with Boolos, (Βωλος, Gleba,) and the sense, which this Greek word bears of *Massa*, Bolus, the rising or swelling object—the *Lump*, will bring us to a great Race of words to be found through the whole compass of Language, as *Ball*, *Balloon*, *Ballot*, *Bell*, *Bowl*, *Bolster*, *Billow*, *Bullet*, *Bul*wark, &c. &c. *Bulla*, *Bullio*, *Bolus*, *Bul*bus, &c. &c. *Pila*, *Pilula*, *Pill*, *Pile*, *Pillar*, *Pellet*, *Pillow*, &c. &c. To pursue this theme would be to consider the force of the Element BL, &c., which is not the business of the present discussion. I was desirous only of giving the Reader a glimpse into the mode, by which Affinities are propagated, that he may perceive by actual examples, how far and wide they extend themselves on all sides;—how close—united and constant is that species of relation between words, in each Language, and in all the Languages around it, which the Etymologists have conceived to be so loose—so solitary, and so capricious.

I shall now advance to the conclusion, for which the preceding observations were intended to prepare the mind of the Reader; and I trust, that they will be considered as abundantly sufficient for that purpose. It must be remembered, that in this Preliminary part of my Work, I can profess only to lead the understanding into such a train of thought, and to produce such acknowledged facts, as to supply sufficient evidence for the foundation of a Theory, on which our future Researches are to proceed, and which is afterwards to be developed and illustrated, through the whole compass of Language, in a series of continued proofs, all agreeing and co-operating with each other. I have laboured to expose the false and perverted conceptions,

tions, which all the enquirers into Language have before entertained on the Affinities of Human Speech, in which detail I have endeavoured to conduct the mind into a view of the true mode, by which such operations are performed; and I have produced a brief series of examples, in which that mode is illustrated. We have seen, how under these views of the question the Affinities of Human Speech are multiplied; and the mind is directly conducted to an idea of that close and intimate connexion between Languages, which the innumerable facts produced by the enquirers into this subject would teach us to expect, but which they themselves have so inadequately and falsely conceived. This intimate Affinity between Languages, not only of kindred Dialects belonging to the same class, but of those likewise, which belong to different classes, has in truth been the perpetual theme of almost all writers, who have made any enquiries of importance on the subject of Human Speech; though no one has formed the least idea of the process, by which it acts, or conceived any project of a general principle, by which it could be illustrated.

There is a certain order of writers on this subject, who have been so impressed with the notion of this intimate affinity, that they have supposed the existence of some one *Original Language*, from which all the other forms of Human Speech have been derived.—This distinguished honour has been commonly conferred on that peculiar Language; with which the Theorist, who maintained such an opinion, was himself most conversant or most enamoured. The *Hebrew*—the *Gothic*—the *German*—*Welsh*—*Irish*—and *Greek* Languages, &c. &c. have in their turns been each of them exalted to this preeminence of station: though we shall now understand, that this dignity is not to be conferred on any one of the fleeting forms of mutable Languages, but on that *Original*—*Elementary*—*unperishing Language*, which pervades all these kindred forms perpetually liable to the accidents of change, and which at once constitutes and records the fact of their affinity. I perfectly agree therefore with these Theorists on the existence of some *Universal Language*, and we differ only on the mode, in which such an idea is to be conceived. Under my view of the subject, that *Universal Language* at this very moment actually exists,

exists, not indeed preeminently appearing in any one peculiar form of Speech, among these kindred Languages, but in that *Elementary Language*, abstracted from every peculiar form, which constitutes the affinity of the whole. We all know, that every form of spoken Language, now existing either in writing or speech, has been or is, perpetually changing; and how then is the existence of an *Original Language* to be conceived, when there is no defined period fixed for its operation. It is not necessary to pursue this idea on the present occasion; and I produce the Theory of an *Original Language* in order to exhibit the prevailing opinion on that intimate state of union, by which the various forms of Speech are connected with each other. Yet even on this conception of some *one Original Language* our enquirers were equally removed from all just ideas on the nature and extent of the Affinity, which must necessarily exist from the operation of such a cause. The examples, which they produced as proofs of this Affinity, still continued in their conceptions to be barren and unproductive relations, generating nothing, and leading to nothing. The supporters of this opinion had formed no idea whatever of any maxim—principle, or artifice, by which any approaches even could be made to illustrate that species of *General—Universal Affinity* between *Languages*, which from their own Theory must necessarily exist. Though the extent, which this acknowledged Affinity pervades, has not yet in all cases been accurately decided, yet it is allowed to have operated through so wide a sphere of action, that there is probably no Form of Speech at present spoken in the world, which is altogether removed from the sphere of its influence. This is not the place, in which such a subject can be duly unfolded; yet I might venture to observe, that of all the Languages, which have passed under my view, polished or barbarous, as they have been called, I have discovered none, in which I did not see the most unequivocal marks of the general Affinity.

I shall now therefore state my hypothesis respecting this species of Affinity, about which so much has been said, and so little been understood. My position then is, that as in each peculiar Language, and in the Dialects of kindred Languages belonging to each of the

the different Classes, the same Elementary Consonants convey the same Fundamental idea, and as the different Classes have been acknowledged to bear the most intimate relation to each other; we have good reason to conjecture or conclude, as the foundation of an Hypothesis, on which our Researches on Language may proceed, that *the* SAME ELEMENT *conveys the* SAME FUNDAMENTAL IDEA *through* ALL LANGUAGES, *within the sphere of this acknowledged Affinity; from which probably no form of Speech now spoken on the face of the Globe is altogether excluded.*

One great cause, from which our perverted notions have arisen on the subject of Human Speech, is our veneration for the Greek and Latin Languages, and for the beings by whom they were spoken, which has indeed absorbed all our senses, and confounded all our faculties. Whenever we ventured to reflect on the subject of Languages, it was only through the medium of Greek and Latin, which we appeared to consider, as standing aloof and exempt from all the accidents of Human Speech, as existing by a property inherent in themselves, and as formed on laws and principles peculiar to themselves;—as invested with that wondrous property of relation to other Languages, by which they were privileged rather to impart than destined to suffer affinity; and as placed in that high and commanding spot in the world of words, at which every thing was bound to follow, and nothing able to precede.

Strange as these conceptions may appear, nothing is more certain, than that all the Languages, which we are accustomed to call Modern, have been considered by such Etymologists under this point of view, and that they have been referred to the Greek and Latin Languages, as to the original and primitive source, from which they were derived. It is certain likewise, that there are or have been times, in which any other mode of considering the subject would have been regarded, as the idle theory of a wild and ignorant babbler, uninitiated into the greater mysteries of Greek and Latin lore, and uttering strange and delusive doctrines on the subject of Languages. What would have exceeded our astonishment, if such a Theorist had ventured to proclaim to us, that the Greek and Latin *Pateer* (Πατηρ) *Pater* were possibly derived from the English *Father*, and not the English *Father* from the Greek and Latin *Pateer—Pater*. Yet surely this mode of conceiving the matter should not excite in us any violent emotions of alarm; unless we suppose, that the claims of the English Language to the honours of Antiquity, when contrasted with the Greek and Latin, are destroyed or diminished by the accident of its duration. If this should be our opinion, and if we should imagine, that duration is incompatible with the properties of age; let us still remember to the honour of our Mother Tongue, as the good Citizen is said to have done in rehearsing the praises of his native city, that our Language, whatever it may be at present, was certainly in *former* times an *Ancient* Language. If this maxim should be tenable, which perhaps some may be disposed to be-

lieve, we shall begin to suspect; that the case, which I have suggested, is not wholly removed from the sphere of possibility, and that the Greek and Latin PATEER—PATER, with all their claims to antiquity, may perchance in *former* times, when our Mother Tongue, was an *ancient* Language, have been derived from the English FATHER.

Our Etymologists—Philologists, &c. might be divided into different Classes, according to the perverted notions, which they have conceived on the nature of Languages, and from the different forms of Speech, to which each class has been devoted, as to an object of exclusive adoration. Among these Classes the *Greek* and *Latin Etymologists*, as they might justly be called, are preeminently distinguished above their brethren, and may afford us a notable example of that state of intellect, when men are lost in the labyrinth of a little Learning, which they have been accustomed to consider as supplying all the materials of Human knowledge, and all the means of Human information.—If it has ever fallen to the lot of Learned Wights to have been lost and bewildered in a labyrinth like this; such assuredly has been the fate of our Latin and our Greek Etymologists.—With this race of Enquirers the whole world of Human Speech is a Latin and a Greek world, and it is marvellous to observe, by what a great school of disciples these teachers are surrounded.—It is indeed marvellous to observe, with what complacency and confidence we all look on the hard earned pittance of our little Latin and our less Greek, as on rich and ample stores, which are alone abundant for all our necessities and competent for all our purposes, through the whole compass of Human Knowledge, whatever we may project, and whatever we may pursue.—It should seem too, as if in the process of learning these Languages we had endeavoured to solve one of the most difficult problems, which has ever been proposed in the doctrine of *Maximums* and *Minimums*,—'The acquisition of the *least* 'possible knowledge by the *greatest* possible labour.'—There are few of us, I imagine, who are not able to testify from their own experience, that no problem has been ever more felicitously solved in theory, or more efficiently produced into practice. Wherever we turn our eyes, the effects of this process are always visible and always the same.

The maxims, which I have above delivered on the Affinity of Languages, will shew us, that in the composition of a Dictionary in which the author presumes to decide on the derivation of words, no project can be more idle, than the attempt to confine this operation within the limits of the peculiar Language, which is the object of enquiry. In our Greek Vocabularies, as the compilation of *Hederic*, &c. &c. the humble Philologist has soon arrived at the termination of his labours, as they relate to the derivations which are more immediately connected with the genius of the Language. He will readily discover the composition of some words from known particles, and the formation of others by established analogies; but beyond these limits all is obscurity and confusion. If the lively Greek, the speaker and the writer of the Language, were perchance capricious—negligent or forgetful;—if in expressing portions of a similar idea, he sometimes recorded his feelings under the symbol κβ, KB, and again under the form of χβ, ChB, our Philologists are at once lost and confounded in their enquiries. This shade of a shade of difference (if I may so express it) is to *them* the Wall of Semiramis; through which no powers of mind can penetrate—which no force of intellect can break down. The kindred words, which the same ideas have produced, become at once remote and distant from each other, as creatures

creatures of another world; and all traces of their affinity are for ever obliterated. Even the change in the symbol of a breathing is able to derange the system of our Lexicographers; and the devices of their art grow feeble and inefficient before such formidable difficulties. In the writings of the Greek the idea of privation has been represented by the symbol α: In his mouth it is a fleeting breathing; and if perchance the recorder of this varying sound should unfortunately be no Etymologist—if he should forget or be ignorant, that his word was a compound formed from this privative breathing, which was commonly represented by this privative symbol α; If, I say, he should think nothing about all this or care nothing about all this, and unwittingly record the breathing by ε, ο, ι, υ, αι, ει, οι, (e, o, i, u, ai, ei, oi,) &c. &c. the word is again lost for ever to the Etymologist:—It stands alone:—It is derived from nothing:—His α *privativa* has disappeared, and all his resources are exhausted.

Though our Lexicographer is unable to see the things which *do* exist, he is singularly sagacious in discovering those which do *not*. He not only tells us from what source a word is really derived, but he likewise informs us from what source it *ought* to be derived. This precious idea exceeds all the specimens of his craft. For every *future* in *Eso*, (ησω,) &c. he has a verb in εω, (*Eo*) from which in his conception it *ought* to be derived. His system is built on the hypothesis, that a Greek never ventured to open his mouth, when he had occasion to express a future action by the analogy *Eso*, till he had perfectly ascertained by the most diligent researches, that a verb in εω, (*Eo*,) was already in existence, from which it *ought* to be derived. In what terms can I seriously reply to such an 'infinite mock' as this? It is true indeed that the Greeks talk in analogies, and it is equally certain that they cannot talk otherwise. It is true moreover, that a race of words is to be found in the Greek Language, in which εω, (*Eo*,) added to something signifies I *do* an action, and *Eso*, (ησω,) added to the same, means I *shall* do the action (Φιλ-εω, Φιλ-ησω); as in our Language a race of words exists, in which a term in its simpler state denotes the present, I *love*, and with the addition of *d* or *ed*, signifies the past, I *loved*; but do our children or do our men, when they are desirous of expressing a past action by the analogy of *d* or *ed*, stop to consider, whether a word is in existence, without the *d* or the *ed*, signifying the action in the present? They think nothing—they know nothing about the relation of the past or the future to the present. The English and the Greeks know only or rather feel only, that they have been accustomed to *Eso* and to *Ed*, (if I may so express myself,) when they are desirous of denoting what they *shall* do, and what they *have* done. And this is all which they think or know about the matter:—This is all the analogy, which operates on the minds of those who form Languages; and a more potent analogy, conducting to a more consummate regularity, cannot well be imagined. If the Being, who is accustomed to *Eso*, when he wishes to denote some future action, is likewise accustomed to *Eo*, when he expresses some action present, there will necessarily exist an abundant race of words, in which he will be found to *Eso* and to *Eo* on the same occasion, or in representing the same idea; and hence it is, that a race of words would be generated, in which the future *is formed*, as the Grammarians would tell us, *from* the present, by changing *Eo* into *Eso*. With this process of formation in his head, the simple Grammarian is at once lost and confounded. Having established this necessary

necessary dependance of the future on the present, which his own jargon only has created; he is not satisfied with the safe possession of a word in *Eso*, till he has discovered a verb in *Eo*, from which it *ought* to be derived.

In Languages there are no anomalies—there *can* be no anomalies. Man cannot attempt to convey an idea, unless the words are accommodated to some order—form—or analogy, which before existed. The Language of our children, in endeavouring to express their meaning, is constructed on the most scrupulous laws of the more general analogy; and if they are wrong, as we should call it, that is, if they offend against the common usage of the Language, it is in those cases, where a less general analogy has operated in producing a race of words, which are not yet so familiar to their knowledge. I do not say that insulated words may not be found in every Language, which we shall be unable to refer to any existing analogy; but these are the effects of change and accident, about which the speaker is equally indifferent, as he was about the existence of these analogies. I must again repeat, that the Beings, who have formed and who utter Language, care nothing and think nothing about the anomalies or analogies, with which it may abound:—Still, however, those Beings do not and cannot utter Language without adopting words, which are related to some analogy; and the anomalies, which are said to exist, are commonly those, which are to be found only in the maxims of the Grammarian. Thus, in Greek, Οισω and Ηνεγκα are both accommodated to the most familiar analogies of that Language. In the Οισω, (*Oiso*,) the speaker does what he has been accustomed to do in expressing something future; and in the Ηνεγκα, (*Enegka*,) he has the same form, which he has been used to adopt, when he expresses a past action—the preceding *e*, (ε,) and final *a*, (α); and his terms are derived from a race of words, in which the sounds of *Ois* or *Enk* prevail, signifying to *bear—take*, &c. In short, they belong to what, in the Language of my hypothesis, are called the Elements ^S and ^NK, which the Reader will find discussed in the succeeding pages (772, &c.) If, however, Οισω and Ηνεγκα, (*Oiso* and *Enegka*,) are referred to the *same system*, and called the Future and the Aorist of Φερω, then indeed they are truly anomalies. But this, we perceive, is not an anomaly, for which the Greeks are answerable. They were totally unconscious of this system, and had formed these words according to the strict rules of an analogy, which was before impressed upon their minds. It is an anomaly, which exists only in the brain of the Grammarian, who has entangled himself, and others like himself, in the toils of his own gibberish. It is in learning this craft that our poor boys are beaten to mummies by enraged Pedagogues; and the precious days of youth are passing away, which can never again be recalled or repaired. We may treat in the Language of ridicule the inanity of the jargon; but emotions far different will be excited, when we reflect on the enormity of the abuse.

The

(2.)

The Writer, having shewn by a brief train of reasoning, illustrated by some examples, that the same Element bears the same meaning 'through all Languages, which a cer-'tain Affinity is acknowledged to pervade,' proceeds, lastly, to enquire, *how this Fundamental idea is to be discovered*:—That is, whether it be probable, that any favourable circumstances exist in Languages, by which this *Fundamental idea* can be ascertained with such success and effect, as to supply materials for the foundation of a System, not metaphysical, but practical and productive.—For this purpose, it is necessary to discover, what may be the object or objects, which would probably seize on the mind of man, in suggesting the *first* or *prevailing* ideas communicated by Language, which still continue to exert their influence, and are still felt and acknowledged.—The Writer, supported by a view of the question à priori, which all would allow to a certain extent, and by acknowledged facts, most prominent and familiar, finally concludes, that the great object, to which we are indebted for the materials of Human Speech is the EARTH, or, that *The Fundamental idea, prevailing in Languages, under different Elementary characters, is to be found in the* EARTH, SOIL,&c. &c., *and the various Properties, Accidents, and Operations attached to it.*

WE have now advanced in the formation of our Theory to the comprehensive conclusion, that *the same Element bears the same meaning*, through all Languages, among which a certain affinity has been acknowledged to exist; and as no bounds have been yet assigned to this affinity, it is not improbable, that there is no Language, now spoken on the face of the Globe, which is altogether removed from the sphere of its influence. This latter part of the position however forms no object in the question, which I am desirous to establish; and I suggest it merely as an idea, which I consider to be probable only, from the imperfect state of the evidence, which has been obtained on a subject so difficult and neglected. No regular and authentic information has been yet communicated on many forms of Speech, which are spoken by nations called Barbarous: and when we cast our eyes over the attempts which have been made to afford us information on this point; we are unable to decide, whether the speakers

or

or the recorders of these forms of Speech were best qualified to convey ideas, or most enlightened in the Theory of Languages. Such strong and striking facts however have occasionally been produced, relating to the universal operation of this affinity, that we should find it difficult to fix on any portion of the Globe, from which its influence can be affirmed to be wholly excluded. But whatever may be thought on this point, it forms no part of the object, which I am anxious to ascertain in the discussions of the present Work. Abundant labour will remain upon our hands, if we should endeavour to prove to a certain extent, by due and sufficient evidence, that the *same Element bears the same meaning in all those Languages,* which are best known and understood; and which are acknowledged to be related to each other by the various writers, who have been employed in the investigation of such subjects.

There is yet however another material question, which remains to be examined, before we are enabled to form any well-founded opinion, that our Theory can be applied to those purposes of utility, which are intended to be accomplished in the formation of a general System. It is now our business to enquire, *How this Fundamental idea, thus pervading the Elements of Human Speech, is to be discovered,* and whether it is probable, that such a discovery will ever be pursued with any considerable effect in the arrangements of Language. This indeed is a most important part of our enquiry, as all our labours in ascertaining the Elementary forms, under which affinities must exist, if they exist at all; and the probability, that the same forms universally convey the same Fundamental idea, will be vain and unavailing, unless we have the means of discovering with some facility and certainty, what that Fundamental idea is, and what are the great leading senses, into which such an idea would naturally and readily pass. Now unless some favourable circumstances have operated in the formation of Language, which may lead us to this discovery, and which may afterwards assist us in applying that discovery with effect; all our diligence and acuteness might be exerted in vain, when we attempt to pursue the devious though directed course of Human ideas through the mazes of the mind.

Let

Let us now therefore apply ourselves to the consideration of a question, about which so much unprofitable discussion has been exhibited, *The Formation of Language*, or the process, by which ideas have been impressed upon words in the composition of Human Speech. When I talk of the *unprofitable* state of this discussion, I do not refer to the falseness of any opinions, which may have been delivered on this subject, as they are either of such a nature, that we have no means of deciding, whether they are true or false; or, if they are true, they are such trivial and unimportant truths, which have been perpetually said, and which belong only to a few words perpetually produced. Among all the Etymologists, the writers on the *Theory of Language* are the only personages of their race, who have never contributed, I might almost venture to assert, one single fact to the common stock belonging to the Art; and certainly they have never added one single fact derived from the principles of their Theory, which is totally incapable either in their hands, or under the guidance of others, to advance a single step beyond its own limits in the discovery of any one affinity existing in Language. Let us endeavour then to find some principle, which shall extend through a wide sphere of action, and which shall exhibit its efficacy in known—intelligible and acknowledged examples, under the familiar operations of Human Speech; and which shall refer to some constant and powerful sources of impression, ever present—ever visible, and ever felt. If our Principle or Theory is involved with any latent—obscure, or unintelligible impressions;—if the causes or sources, to which we attribute such great effects, are not at this moment visible to all—intelligible to all—and operating on all; we may be assured, that our Theory is indeed nothing but Theory, idle, empty, and inefficient! either false or foolish—untrue or unprofitable.

Under this spirit of enquiry let us open our eyes upon the world around us, and consider, what objects and actions are to be found, which would probably seize upon the mind of man, and supply the first and prevailing ideas, communicated by Language. When I talk of the *first* ideas suggesting themselves to man, I am not referring to periods and conditions, about which we know nothing, and in the discussion of which we can be led only to barren—unproductive metaphysical

metaphysical deductions, but to those *first* and *predominating* ideas, which would naturally be impressed with peculiar effect in the earlier periods of Society, so as to produce terms directly impregnated with their force, which still continue to exert their influence, upon the mind, though after a different mode, and which do in fact exhibit at this very moment, through the whole compass of Language, the most strong and striking proofs of their effect, perpetually felt, and universally acknowledged. I must again unequivocally press on the understanding of my Readers, that I look only to that stage or period of *cause* and *effect*, in the formation of Words, as impregnated with ideas, when *cause* and *effect* may be so seen and understood, as to become intelligible objects of discussion, and to lead us to the discovery of numerous *facts* in Language, respecting the relations of Words to each other, which were before totally unknown. In all subjects, a series of causes may be conceived or supposed, which shall operate in a corresponding series of effects; and there is always a point, at which mere Theory commences, and where all is darkness and obscurity. With this stage in the series of *causes* and *effects* I have nothing to do. My thoughts are directed only to the discovery of some *early* or *prevailing*—*predominating cause* in the series of *causes*, by which Languages have been formed, which has impressed upon them their prevailing and predominating force; and which, when once discovered by a probable train of reasoning, supported by numerous—strong, and unequivocal facts, acknowledged by all to exist through the whole compass of Language, may be afterwards applied with facility and success to the discovery of innumerable other *facts*, which are now totally concealed and hidden from the view.

Now where is the great object to be found, which, as we might naturally conceive, would first seize upon the mind of man, and supply him with the prevailing ideas, conveyed by the sounds or words, which were uttered by the organs of speech? Are we to look up to the *Sun*, the *Moon*, or the *Stars?* Are we to regard the Elements *Air*, *Water*, *Fire*, *Wind*, *Rain*, *Thunder*, &c. Where can we find, or where can we expect to find an agent sufficiently potent and predominating

dominating for a purpose like this, but in that great object, which is ever present with us, at all times, and on all occasions, on which all other objects, capable of being seen or felt, either actually exist, or exhibit their force and influence, which in every period of Society perpetually presses on the attention of man, as the scene of his actions and his necessities, and which in most periods engages his incessant care and solicitude, as supplying the indispensable means for his nourishment and support. This great object, so interesting—so important, which must necessarily predominate over the mind of man, is assuredly the EARTH.

There is no one, I think, who will not instantly grant, that a more promising and productive object for the materials of Human Speech, cannot be conceived; and there is no one, I imagine, who would not venture to decide *à priori*, that such an object must necessarily have operated to a considerable extent at least, in the *formation* of Languages. All moreover know and acknowledge, from examples every where visible, that it has operated in the most strong and striking manner, in supplying ideas, which might seem on the first view most remote from the nature of the object; and all surely will allow, that it has probably operated in numerous other instances, where the effects of its influence are no longer visible. Whatever may be our opinions of the extent, through which this influence has been spread; we shall all, I think, concur to wonder, that this idea has never been suggested, as capable at least of affording a probable and promising source for some portion of the materials, of which Languages are composed. Surely no idea can be more probable, than that the terms, which denote the EARTH, SOIL, &c., and those, which express the operations performed on its surface, as *Ploughing—Harrowing—Digging*, &c. would belong to each other; and yet even this has not been seen; but here, as in other cases, such terms appeared to be insulated and separated from each other. We shall not wonder, that words containing metaphorical allusions, derived from the same source, have not been understood; though the process, by which these allusions are conducted, is distinctly visible in acknowledged and familiar examples.

It will at once be directly seen, how favourable this hypothesis is

to the formation of a System, and how all the ideas, which I have before suggested on the Theory of Languages, co-operate to the same end. We perceive, how the process of investigating the relations of Language, which before might seem to be involved in inexplicable intricacy, becomes bounded—distinct, and defined. With the EARTH, its Accidents and Operations we are well acquainted; and when we have duly studied the peculiar habits of the Human Mind in the mode of considering this object and its appendages, from known and acknowledged examples, we shall then be enabled to understand the familiar process, which is passing in Language, and to detect its influence in other examples, where the original idea is no longer visible. We shall now understand, from a review of the conclusions before produced, that our labours are directed only to the study of *one* great *Universal Language*, which is itself derived from *one* great *Universal* object,—ever present—ever visible, and perpetually pressing on the attention of man. We see, how every part of the hypothesis, forming our System, supports and confirms its own conclusions. If Languages, existing in times and places so remote, are at this moment so intimately connected with each other, as to have arisen from *one Universal* Language, it may be well imagined, that the same potent cause must have operated in preserving the Language, which it originally formed. Whatever hypothesis we may have for the existence of kindred Languages spread over the face of the globe; we all allow, that they are now, and have been, through a long period of time, remote and separated from each other; and we may reasonably conjecture, that their affinity could not have remained in so perfect a state, unless the same constant cause had been perpetually employed in preserving the relations of that compages, which it originally formed. As we proceed forward in these discussions, we shall discover in each peculiar Language this secondary process engrafted on the Original Elementary stock; and we shall perceive a series of new senses proceeding from the same Fundamental idea. Thus each Language will exhibit the Elements, containing the same *Fundamental notion*, under varieties of meaning, peculiar to itself; and hence we shall understand, how each Language, under one point of view, may be considered as itself

itself directly formed from the same object, in a manner distinct from the process belonging to the *Universal Language*, of which it is a Dialect. Thus each Language may be considered as indebted for the various turns of meaning, annexed to the words which it contains, to the operation of its own powers, if I may so express it; but it is still recognised to be a kindred portion of the same Universal Language, because the *same* Elements are employed to convey the same fundamental idea, under all the properties of the general affinity. The process, by which these operations are performed, cannot well be understood, till a great series of Facts shall have passed before our view.

In a future page I shall detail, in a brief narrative, some of the various ideas, which we may conceive to have been derived from the EARTH; and I shall shew by some acknowledged examples, how the mind is accustomed to regard that object. We shall at once however see, how this *Fundamental idea* of the EARTH would naturally resolve itself into various other ideas, suggested by that object, which may then be considered as *Fundamental ideas*, pervading large and distinct Classes of Words. Each of these secondary *Fundamental ideas*, if I may so call them, might then branch out into other notions, which might again become *Fundamental notions* to their respective Classes. All this may be arranged with due accuracy and perspicuity, without embarrassment or confusion; and in such an arrangement we should at once see the general affinity, which connects the whole, and the peculiar relations, by which the various parts are distinguished from each other. We shall readily understand, what an abundant source of ideas the EARTH would supply, if we contemplate only in a superficial manner the most familiar and apparent of the *Accidents—Operations—Properties*, &c., which are attached to it, and which would most probably furnish Language with the very terms conveying these ideas.

Among the *Accidents—Operations—Properties*, &c. &c., attached to the EARTH are those belonging to the action of *Stirring it up—Scratching it up—Tearing it up—Routing it up—Scraping—Grating upon it*, &c., with various degrees of *Agitation—Commotion—Noise*, &c.

&c.; and in various modes and manners, by the feet—hands—instruments of men, &c.—by the feet—snouts—claws of animals, &c.—by wind—water, &c.—*Digging*—*Ploughing*—*Harrowing*—*Raking*—*Treading*—*Stamping*—*Stepping*—*Walking*—*Drawing*—*Dragging*, &c. &c., as likewise those expressing the various objects to be found on or under its surface, with their state—form—consistency, &c., as *Dirt, Dust, Mud, Muck, Mould, Mullock, Stone, Sand, Grit, Soil, Clay, Chalk, Slime, Slop, Slush, Clod, Clump, Lump, Glebe, Globe, Bog, Podge, Pudge, Puddle, Rough, Smooth, Hard, Solid, Soft, Wet, Dry, Moist*, &c. &c. We should, I think, on the first view of the question, be disposed to believe, that the words, which express objects and actions, such as I have enumerated, would be derived from the EARTH. Now I shall prove in the progress of my Work, that the very terms, which I have adopted in the above explanation, do actually belong to a great Race of words, denoting the EARTH, SOIL, &c. and its Accidents, &c. each to its peculiar class, according to the laws, which I have laid down respecting the Cognate Consonants. Thus, HARROW, HARD, ROUT, ROUGH, RAKE, belong to the Element ^R, R}C, D, &c. to ERa, (Ερα,) EARTH, aRETZ, (Ital.) &c. TRead, DRy, DRaw, DRag, belong to TERRa, (Lat.) TIR, DAIAR, (Celt.) under the Element C, &c.}R}c, &c. B, &c. to which we must add SCRatch, GRate, GRit, SCRape, &c. &c.—MUD, MUCK, MOIST, MASS, belong to each other, under the Element MD.—MOULD, MULLOCK, &c. belong directly to the Element ML. SOIL, SOLum, (Lat.) SOLID, SOLIDus, CLay, CHALK, CLod, SLush, SLime, SLop, CLump, Lump, GLebe, GLobe, &c. belong to the Element C, D, &c.}L}c, D, &c. B, F, &c. BOG, PUDGE, PODGE, PUDDle to B}C, &c. to PEDon, (Πεδον, Solum,) BODen, (Germ.) &c. &c. STONE, SAND, &c. to the Element C, &c.}N, and to KONis, (Κονις,) CŒNum, (Lat.) &c., and so of the rest. As HARD belongs to EARTH, under one Element, so does DURus belong to DAIAR, and SOLID, SOLidus, (Lat.) to SOLum, under other Elementary characters.

Before I proceed further in these discussions it is of the highest importance, that all misconceptions on the nature of my hypothesis should be removed from the mind, arising either from the inadequate mode,

mode, in which I have unfolded my subject, or from that peculiar state of Language itself, which presents even to the most dextrous and adroit a perpetual source of difficulty and embarrassment. The best and most precious of the gifts, which reason has bestowed on man, is assuredly the faculty of Language; yet even this precious gift is subject to the universal lot of all the good, which he possesses, and is oftentimes attended with a portion of evil, which diminishes or defeats the purposes of the possession. We are but little aware of the great extent, through which the evils of Language have operated, by the forms of its construction, in perverting the opinions of mankind; nor would it be easy to enumerate the various sources of deception, which are inherent in the nature of cultivated Speech. Some of these sources are indeed sufficiently visible and understood; but others are so subtle—so latent and remote, that they escape from our detection, and are deeply enveloped under that mysterious web, which Language has spread over her own operations. It has unfortunately happened too for those enquirers, who have devoted themselves to the study of Human Speech, that Language never exhibits the imperfection of its nature under so embarrassing a form, as when it endeavours to unravel its own powers, and to describe its own processes. In the construction of cultivated Speech, the distinctions formed by the various parts, into which it has been separated, though performing in their general application the most useful and important purposes, present oftentimes a great impediment to the progress of our ideas, and the justness of our conceptions. In the distinction formed by those parts, to which Grammarians have affixed the name of *Noun* and *Verb* a great barrier is erected, and we pass with difficulty from an *object* to *action*—from *matter* to *motion*—or, if I may so say, from *death* to *life*, though the mind does not always separate these states in viewing the object itself. We may learn this, if we will endeavour to free our minds from the incumbrances of Language; and we do actually know this to be a fact from the most familiar practice apparent in its construction, where we find, that the *Object* and the *Action*, annexed to it, frequently exist in the same word; or according to the artifice of cultivated Speech in the same word, under some minute

variation

variation of form—adjunct, &c., as The *Bowl*—To *Bowl*, &c.—A *Burn*, To *Burn*—A *Brush*, To *Brush*—A *Crack*, To *Crack*—*Mud*, To *Mud*—*Slush*, To *Slush*, &c. &c. Again, in expressing the same object or same species of object, the mind may be led into error by adopting words, representing either the particular or the general idea.

These observations will be illustrated by the case before us; and the developement of these possible errors may perhaps most contribute to unfold the nature of my hypothesis, and to distinguish that which I do mean, from that which I do not mean. When I state in my hypothesis, that the Words, of which Languages are composed, are derived from *The Earth*; and when in speaking of Words, appearing under the Element ^R, ^RT, &c. I say, that such words are derived from *The* EARTH, &c. &c., there are various modes, in which the mind may be led into error, not so much from the fault of the writer, as from the nature of Language itself. In the word EARTH, standing alone, we see the idea of the material substance *Dirt*, on which we tread—which we stir up with our feet—instruments, &c.; but in the expression *The* EARTH, we have an abstract idea, in which its material parts and attributes, though not altogether hidden, are yet removed from our view. I adopt, however, this latter expression *The* EARTH, not because it really expresses my conceptions in a manner most accordant with the nature of the subject, but because it is an expression best accommodated to the Language of those, to whom these discussions are directed. Under one sense of the expression indeed, it is sufficiently precise; and if the Reader should understand by it, that the Words in Language are derived from the *Objects* and *Actions* existing in that *Spot*, which under the present forms of our mother tongue we are accustomed to call *The* EARTH, my meaning will be justly conceived, and my purpose has been duly answered by the adoption of the expression. I well know however, that such abstract modes of speaking have often led into the greatest delusions even on the most important occasions; and I may expect, what indeed I have myself felt, that they would exert their influence on a subject like this, removed as it is from our familiar habits of contemplation. We cannot

cannot help considering the term used in this abstract sense, as itself the *sole* or *superior* agent in the process, which we describe; and I have been induced myself to refer other words to such general terms, not indeed subdued by this delusion, but certainly acting under its influence, or accommodating myself to preconceived notions, which arise from the accidents of Language. Thus I have said, that Bog, Pudge, Puddle *belong* to Pedon, (Πεδον, Solum,) and Boden, (Germ.) as if these two terms, because by the accidents of Language they happened to be used in a sense more abstracted, were invested with some superior privileges, by which they were intitled to have other words referred to them, as to a source or origin. The Reader is not to suppose, that I can have any meaning of this kind; and he must diligently remember, that when any similar modes of speaking are adopted, it is meant only, that the words said to belong to a general term, such as Pedon, (Πεδον,) are derived from the *Object* expressed by a certain word belonging to the same race, under the form Pedon, (Πεδον.) Under another point of view Pedon, (Πεδον,) might be considered as the most improper word to be introduced as an example, from the very circumstance, that it is used in a more abstract sense; and therefore more remote from the original idea, which was that of a *Material substance*, as Pudge, existing on the object expressed by this general term. Thus, when in speaking of the Element ^R, ^RT, &c., I say, that words under that form are derived from Era, (Ερα,) Earth, I do not mean, that such words are derived from the very terms themselves Era and Earth, but that they are derived from the *Spot*, which these terms express, and that these terms are themselves belonging to the same race of words. It must assuredly happen, that these very words, expressing such an object as the Era, (Ερα,) Earth, &c. in the Greek and English Languages, will have terms in their respective Languages, which may be justly said to be *directly* derived from them. Each peculiar Language has indeed its own peculiar relations, which however are not frequently so marked and visible, as to afford unequivocal evidence, that such relations are exclusively derived from the operation of each Language. We see perpetually such striking examples of the common Affinity, that in general

general we should speak of terms as belonging to the whole mass of Languages, rather than as the exclusive and peculiar productions of each Language. All that we can do, and indeed all that is to be done, consists in ascertaining the *general affinity*, and this I shall perform, as I trust, with full evidence of the truth of my hypothesis. The particular process, by which the relations of words has been formed, is hidden from our view; and we are not to expect, that a chain of affinities can be exhibited, in which each link will be minutely and accurately arranged. Indeed no such chain is to be found; as in the great operations, by which Languages have been formed words are not to be considered as derived from single words, as in a continued chain or series, but from a general impression of the force annexed to a Race of Words under the same Elementary sounds. That is, the Words under the Elementary Character ^R, ^RΓ, &c. &c. may be said, under one mode of conceiving the matter, to be derived from the Elementary sound ^R, ^R}T, &c. with an Elementary sense.

There is another misconception likewise, into which the mind may fall, arising from a deficiency in cultivated Language, in which *Matter* and its *Action* are separated. I have said, that words are derived from *The* EARTH or EARTH, where I have been obliged to use a substantive, expressing only an object, as *Dirt*, in a dead, inactive state; but if I had been permitted to apply this term, as a verb, '*To* 'EARTH,' signifying *To Stir up the* EARTH, as it is used in Provincial Language, and had said, that Words derived from EARTH and EARTH*ing*, a very different train of ideas would have been presented to the mind. We should have here seen, that the *Agitation* of the EARTH afforded one cause, from which Languages were derived; and this would have opened into a wide field of reflexion. We shall here be brought to an ancient question, which has been so often and pertinaciously discussed, whether *Substantives* or *Verbs* first appeared in the formation of Language. For myself I cannot but declare, most unequivocally, that I am firmly enlisted under the party of the Verbs; and tha I consider their claims to superior antiquity, as most decided and unquestionable. Wherever I turn my eyes I perceive, that the great materials for Language are to be seen in *Action*—in *Commotion*

motion and *Agitation*, &c. This is particularly to be discovered in the consideration of the Element ^R, ^RT, &c., where we do not so much see the ERA or EARTH under the idea of *inactive* matter, but as EAR'*d*, EARTH'*d*, *Stirred up, Raised up, Excited, Agitated*, &c. &c. Wherever this sense is not visible, but where even a contrary sense is expressed, still I find, that the idea of *Agitation* was probably the original source, from which it was derived. Thus, then, I should say, that Language has received all its force from ideas, derived from the *Matter*, and the *Action* or *Agitation* of the Spot, on which we exist; or, if I might be permitted so to express it, from EARTH, EARTH*ing* or EAR*ing*—MUD, MUDD*ing*—SLUSH, SLUSH*ing*, &c. &c., or, as we might say in Latin, 'à SOLO, SOL*icitando*,' &c. &c.

This mode of representing the question will perhaps be sufficiently understood; and it may remove or prevent various misconceptions, which might be formed by those, who are wont to entangle themselves in the mazes of their own minds. I decide nothing in this statement of my hypothesis, on the degree of influence, which the *Matter* of the EARTH, or its *Action*, under the names of *Properties*—*Accidents* or *Operations*, may have had in the production of words. I decide nothing on the peculiar species of *Action*, or the kind of *Accidents* and *Operations*, by which this strong idea of *Agitation*, so visible in the formation of Language, was originally impressed. All the *Accidents* and *Operations* are so blended with each other, and are all so effective in producing and preserving the same train of ideas; that, under one point of view, it is impossible to distinguish one action from another. It must be remembered however, that as our enquiries are directed to the discovery of facts, as they appear in the present state of Language, we may well imagine, that the terms relating to the *Operations* of the Ground, as performed by the labours of *Agriculture* in *Digging*—*Ploughing*—*Harrowing*, &c., would exhibit in the strongest point of view the general Elementary sense of *Agitation*, *Commotion*; and that they might justly be selected as important terms, to which other words conveying a similar idea may be referred. We may justly place these words in the front of our discussions, as exhibiting in the strongest point of view the *Elemen-*

tary sense, and as strongly operative in impressing—propagating and preserving the general Elementary idea, from whatever source that might have been originally derived, and whatever causes may co-operate in confirming and strengthening the impression.

As my hypothesis relates solely to the discovery of facts, which are to be found in Language, as it is now presented to our view, I am totally unconcerned about any opinions, which refer to Language, before it appeared under the form of Language, or which deal only in the detail of a few terms, visible to all, and perpetually repeated by all, and which never have contributed nor ever can contribute to the discovery of a single fact, before hidden and unknown. I have no objection therefore, as it concerns my hypothesis, to any opinions, which have been held on the Theory of Languages, if such positions can be called opinions, which, in truth, propose nothing, and produce nothing. I have no objection to the idea, that Languages have been formed on the principle of *Onomatopœia,* which has been the perpetual theme of all Theorists on the nature of Human Speech. This may be true, and certain words may have been formed on the conception of the speaker, that the sound was an echo to the sense: Still, however, we shall never be able to ascertain, whether it be true or no; and if it be true, it is a truth, which terminates in the words themselves, produced as examples, and which is totally inadequate to the discovery of any other truth whatever. All the words, which have ever been produced as examples of this principle, do not amount probably to two hundred words; and here the knowledge and the efforts of our Theorists terminate. They have not discovered any clue, nor do they pretend to have discovered or even conceived any clue, by which they can advance a single step in the great Labyrinth of Language. No principle—no maxim has ever been proposed, under the guidance of which they can pass from these solitary terms, conveying a similar idea, into the World of Words, with all its infinite variety of purposes and meanings. It is not pretended by our Theorists, that these words perform any efficient part in Language, or are applied to any important objects; nay it has not even entered into their conception, that the exhibition of this idea was of any consequence to the foundation

tion of their Theory,—and that their words, in order to be operative words, must necessarily be attended by these properties. It has never entered into their imagination, that it was necessary to introduce into their Theory that very point, on which alone every thing depended—by which alone it could assume even the appearance of a Theory—without which the proposition became absolute inanity, and as little relative to the performance of any efficient purpose in Language, as any other proposition whatever of any kind, and belonging to any subject, which they might have chosen to produce.

Though the principle of Onomatopæia, under the present view of the question, as supplying to Language only a few solitary and unimportant words has no more to do with a System for conceiving the formation of Language, than any other Principle whatever, as of Gravity, Magnetism, &c. &c., which might have been proposed; yet we shall at once see, that if we combine this idea with the Theory of the EARTH, a new world is directly opened before us; and a conception, which was before totally barren and unproductive, becomes associated with an object, invested with the most ample powers, and pregnant with the most important consequences. We shall find, as we proceed in these discussions, that the words, which are supposed to be formed on the principle of Onomatopæia, are directly connected with the *Accidents—Operations*, and *Properties* of the EARTH, as ROUTE, Stertere; RUDO, &c. ROUT, RUD*era*, (Lat.) &c. &c.; RACL*er*, To RAKE, and its kindred terms *w*ROOTLE, RATTLE, RUTTLE, RUSTLE, &c. SCRIETCH, GRATE, SCRATCH, GRIT; —GRUNT—GROAN, GRIND, a GRIND*ing* Noise, GROUND, and so HIRR*io*, HARSH, HOARSE, &c., (see page 880 of this Work,) belong to ER*a*, EARTH, and their actions EAR*ing*, HARROW*ing*, EARTH*ing*, &c. Thus, then, if we should choose to advance into the regions of Theory, and to ask, whence it was, that the names for the part, on which we tread, &c., as ER*a*, EARTH, was annexed to the Elementary character ^R, I can have no objection to the hypothesis of any Theorist, who should suppose, that it was derived on the principle of Onomatopæia, from the *h*-IRR-*ing* noise, made on its surface by *Treading—Scratching—Grating*, &c. and that the original idea annexed to the ER*a*, (E*ρα*,) was that of the *h*-IRR-*er*.

If

If this should be admitted, every thing will then be performed, which any order of Enquirers into the Mysteries of Language can expect to be atchieved. We have fixed our station on a spot, full of hope and of promise, where the objects are all visible—known and familiar, and from which innumerable *Facts* in Language can be and will be produced. We have proceeded moreover still farther in our enquiries; and for the benefit of those, who are desirous of discovering, what they can probably never find, and which even if it could be found, would disclose nothing but itself, we have penetrated into the dark region of Theory, where any thing may be conceived, and nothing can be seen. It is from the EARTH and the EARTH only, that Language arises into existence—into full—effective—embodied—material existence, if I may so say, or into that state, by which it is enabled to perform the functions of its being, under a visible—operative, and intelligible form; whatever may have been the preceding processes of the mind, or the organs, by which it was originally associated with that spot. It is on the EARTH and the EARTH only, whatever may have been the first efforts of Human Utterance, that the Elementary sound ^R, the "airy nothing," has received a "local habitation and "a name." It is from the EARTH, that the rude *h*-IRR*ing* noise of the Animal, mimic or accidental, became instinct with those powers, by which the mind could operate in the formation of ideas, and vocal with those distinctive sounds, invested with meaning, of which Languages are composed.

(3.)

The Writer, having concluded, by a view of the question *a priori*, supported by certain facts, which all acknowledge to exist, that the Fundamental idea, prevailing in Language, under different Elementary Characters, is to be found in the EARTH, SOIL, &c. and the various Accidents—Operations and Properties attached to it, proceeds to state in the briefest manner *What these Elementary Characters are which denote the* EARTH, &c. and to detail *Some of the acknowledged facts, relating to the influence of the* EARTH *on Language, which are perpetually visible.* The Writer gives a concise statement of the various ideas, which we might conceive on the first view of the question, to be derived from that source.—Observations arising from a view of the whole subject.—The conclusion of the Preliminary Dissertation.

IN the preceding division of this Section, I have concluded that the EARTH is the great object, which has supplied the materials of Language; or that *The Fundamental idea prevailing in Languages, under different Elementary characters is to be found in the* EARTH, SOIL, &c. &c. *and the various Accidents, Operations and Properties attached to it.* This conclusion is supported by the probability of the idea, *à priori*; and likewise by the acknowledged and familiar facts, abounding in Language, in which the operations of this cause are unequivocally exhibited. I shall now proceed to state after the most concise manner, *The different Elementary Characters, under which the Earth with its Accidents, &c. has been represented:* and I shall likewise give a very *Brief detail of some familiar examples, which have been acknowledged to be derived from the* EARTH *and its Accidents*, &c. &c. Though these instances are known and familiar to all; yet the observations, with which they will be accompanied, may serve to place them in a new point of view; and the reader may

may at once understand, how a series of facts, with which he is most conversant, confirms in the strongest manner the principles of the hypothesis, which has now for the first time passed before his mind.

Our attention is first directed to the Elementary Character, which forms the subject of inquiry in the present Volume — the Element ^R, ^R} c, &c. B, &c. L, N, &c. belonging to the ERa, (Epa,) EARTH, ARVum, &c. In this volume I shall consider likewise the Elementary form ^C, ^D, &c. belonging to ESTia (Εστια), &c. because the ^R is intimately connected with the class C, D, &c. though they may be regarded as constituting separate Elementary Characters; as I have sufficiently shewn in a former page (35, &c.) The other Elementary Characters will form the subject of discussion in future volumes of my Work.—I have shewn in the present volume, that the form ^NK, &c. is attached to the Element ^GG, &c., or G, and I have produced some of the words, belonging to it, as HANK, HAND, &c. which fully express the sense of the Element.— When it denotes *Being*, as in ANER, (Ανηρ,) UNus, ONE, &c., it either signifies the strong powerful personage—the HANKer, or what is ONE, an Individual, from being HANKed IN, as it were, separate and distinct from others.

The Element B, F, P, V, W,} R,} c, &c. B, &c. L, N, will supply a separate discussion. The Greek BOR=BOROS, (Βορβορος, Limus, Cœnum) from which BARBAROUS is derived, where the BR is doubled, in order to express the idea more strongly, and PHURO, (φυρω, Misceo, Commisceo Fœdo,) will shew us the sense of the Element. In Arabic and Persian بر BR is the *Earth*, &c. &c. In Welsh BRO is a Region, Country.—The English BEAR—the Latin and Greek FERO, PHERO, (Φερω,) to which we may add PARIO, PARO, to *pre*PARE, the Hebrew ברא BRA, To Create, Produce, "In the beginning God *Created*," &c. will shew us, how concordant Languages are in the Elementary sense. Let us mark the PRO in PRO*duce*, which brings us to a great Race of words, PRO, (Προ), PRÆ, FORE, FOR*th*, &c. &c. which mean nothing, but to Stir up, To BR*ing* or Cast FOR*th* the BOR or Dirt. We see in

BEAR

Bear, Bring, Burden, Birth, &c., how accretions attach themselves to the Elementary form BR.

The Element M}R,} c, &c. B, &c. L, N will be examined in a separate part of my Work; though it is often connected with the form BR. The terms Mire, (Eng.) Merda, Marga, (Lat.) Mergel, (Fr.) Marl, (Eng.), &c. &c., will fully shew us the sense of the Element. In For-*mica* and Mur-*mex*, (Μυρμηξ,) we see how the forms FR and MR are sometimes connected with each other. In Mur-Mur, Mur-Muro, (Lat.) Mor-Muro, (Μορμυρω,) we have the Element doubled, as in Bor-Bor-*os*, Bor-Bor-*uzo*, (Βορβορος, Cœnum, Βορβορυζω). To the Element MR belong, we see, those important terms Mor*ior*, which literally means To be reduced to Mire, Mor*talis*, Mor*tal*, &c. This Elementary form will shew us, how *Water* may be derived from the *Earth*, &c.—The Latin Mare is attached to the idea of the place full of Mire, as we plainly see in the parallel English term Mear Mere (Sax.), "A Mere, Palus, Lacus," as Lye explains the Saxon word.—I scarcely can recollect any term, which shews us more fully the humble source, from which Languages are derived, and the union of Languages, than a word, which now passes before my view. — The term Margarit*es*, (Μαργαριτης,) *Margarita*,) the Pearl, is supposed to be of Greek origin, and perhaps the frequency of the word in modern Languages may be attributed to this source. In French and in English it is the name of a woman, and in the former Language it means a Daisy. Yet this word is a Saxon compound, and signifies nothing but Mear-Grit, the *Grit—Grout* or Dirt of the Mear or Sea, "The Pearl in the foul Oyster." In Lye a term, in the same column with Mere is "Mere-*Grot*, *Margarita*." Through the whole compass of Language MR signifies, what is *Great*, *Illustrious*, &c. and hence we have Homer, Maro, Emir, Impero, Emperor, our surname Moore, &c., which signified originally the *Raised* or *Abundant Heap* of Mire. In our comparative More, which will remind us of the Greek Mur*ios*, (Μυριος,) we see more strongly the idea of Abundance, as it might be of a confused heap of Mire. Hence the German Scholars will understand, why Mar signifies, according to Wachter, "Princeps, Dominus, &c. et

"Mollis,

"Mollis;" i. e. the soft MIRE—Stuff. The term *Great*, with its parallel term *Gross*, belongs to *Grit*, *Grout*, &c., for the same reason. I have opened a world of secrets indeed to the mind of the Reader, when I have informed him, that wherever he sees an MR, he finds nothing but the Fundamental idea of MIRE.

A very important race of words is supplied by that Element, where the ^R is preceded by the Class C, D, &c., and succeeded by its ordinary attendants, as explained in a former page. This Element we may represent by C, D, &c.}R}c, &c. B, &c. L, N. We shall instantly recollect, as belonging to this Element the Latin TERRA, with its parallels produced by Lhuyd, TIR, DAIAR, DOR, &c. I dare not venture to entangle myself in this great Race of words; yet we shall readily call to memory the following terms, TERO, (Lat.) TEIRO, TRUO, (Τειρω, Τρυω, Tero,) TIRE, *s*TIR, TAR-TAR, TAR-TAR-*us*, DIR*t*, DR*egs*, (Eng.) TR*ux*, (Τρυξ,) STERC*us*, SOR*des*, (Lat.) DR*aw*, DR*ag*, TR*aho*, TR*ead*, TR*ot*, TR*ack*, TR*ace*, &c. &c. GORE, CORE, GR*ound*, (Eng.) SKOR, (Σκωρ, Stercus,) SCOR*ia*, (Lat.) CR*uor*, (Lat.) GRU, (Γρυ, Quicquid minimum est, *Sordes*, &c.) SAR*ro*, KOR*eo*, (Σαρω, Κορεω, Verro,) SARR*io*, SARC*ulum*, (Lat.) SORE, SCORE, SCAR, GR*it*, GR*out*, GR*ate*, SCR*atch*, GR*aze*, CR*ates*, (Lat.) To CARD wool, &c. SCR*uta*, SCR*utor*; and the terms for Noise, CR*y*, JARR, JARG*on*, CR*ack*, CR*oak*, CR*eak*, GR*ate*, SHR*ick*, SCR*ietch*, GER*uo*, KER*usso*, (Γηρυω, Sono, Κηρυσσω, Præconio promulgo,) GARR*io*, QUER*or*, COR*nix*, COR*vus*, KOR*ax*, (Κοραξ,) KR*izo*, (Κριζω,) TR*uzo*, TR*izo*, (Τρυζω, Τριζω,) STR*ideo*, &c. &c. If we should consider the *R*, as supplying the original Elementary character, from which these various forms are derived, the whole might be represented by C, &c. B, &c.}R}c, &c. B, &c. L, N, &c.

When the letters of the Class C, D, &c. are joined with each other, we have the form C, D, &c.}C, D, &c. The Latin CAC*o* with its parallels under such various forms, as CHEZ*o*, (Χεζω,) the German SCHIESS*en*, &c. &c. will shew us, how the idea of *Filth* and *Dirt* belongs to this Element. Hence we have the Greek KAK*os*, (Κακος, Malus); and hence likewise, remote as they may seem, the English

CAKE,

Cake, Cook and Coquo, &c. *Coquere* glebas *. The English Cut with the terms of *Dispersion—Agitation*, &c. Jacio, (Lat.) Shed—Shoot—Shatter—Scatter, &c. and their parallels Seco, Scidi, Skizo, Skao, Skazo, Skedao, (Σκιζω, Scindo, Σχαω, Σκαζω, *Scarifico*, Σκεδαω, Dissipo, &c.) will lead us through a wide sphere in discovering the sense of this race of words, which belong to the action of the Soc, &c. the Plough-share in *Stirring up the Ground*—the *Terra* Sauc*ia* vomeribus. I shew (p. 658,) that the Sack, about which we have heard so much, as pervading all Languages, is nothing but the *Hollow*—Cut—the Sec*ata* Terra; and that 'To Sack,' the verb, expresses the action of Cutt*ing* this hollow *out—up*. In Scotch, Seuch is a Furrow, a Small Ditch; and Seuch, as a verb, means to Cut or divide. In Spanish, Sac*ar* means "To Clear, To Free, To "*pull* or *draw out*," which is the sense of our word Suck, and Sach*ar*, is "*To turn the Ground* with a hoe or dibble," where we have the true idea:—Saco is a "Sack, or bag for carrying or trans- "porting any thing," and "Pillage, Plunder."— Under the form TG, DG, &c. we have Dig, Dust, Dike, Duco, (Lat.) Duc*ere* Fossam,

---

* It is marvellous to observe, how adroit boys are in perceiving resemblances, which are only to be discovered by those of a riper age by a great effort of the understanding. If the Instructors of our Youth would introduce to the knowledge of their scholars the Elementary doctrine here unfolded, they would be amply rewarded in the instructions, which they in their turn would receive from their scholars on this subject. The mind of a boy, not sophisticated by much or injudicious instruction, is precisely in the same state, as that of the inventors of Language; and so convinced am I of the superior sagacity of this order of enquirers not marred by age, or learning, as it is called, on a subject of this kind, that I should most willingly apply to such an oracle, whenever any difficult or doubtful point passed before my view. Though I was always well aware, that Cake was derived from the idea of *Dirt*, as in the phrase, 'It is all in a Caked state— "A Cake of *Dirt*;" yet I once, for the purpose of curiosity, told a boy, not nine years of age, whom I had before a little exercised in the doctrine of Elementary Language, that Cake belonged to the idea of *Dirt*, and desired him to discover the reason, when he almost instantly replied, 'Because it is all of a *Lump*.' It is scarcely possible to be believed, except by those, who have made the experiment, how much this doctrine of Elementary Speech assists the mind and memory of the learner in catching and retaining the senses of Words, which belong to an unknown Language.

Fossam, To make a DIKE; *Dicere*, Proferre Sermonem, To draw forth words; TEICHOS, (Τειχος,) the *Ditch*, To DIGHT or Dress Land; TEUCHO, (Τευχο, Paro,) DIK*ella*, (Δικελλα, Ligo,) the instrument of DIGG*ing*, &c. DIKO, (Δικω, Jacio,) To DIGG, or DASH out—about, &c.; the German terms ZEUG*en*, or *TS*EUG*en*, To beget, *Zichen*, or ZIEG*hen*, "To draw, pull or TUG," which mean, To DIG, or Draw out, *pro*DUC*ere*, will shew us, how the words under the forms SG, DG, become united. Under the Dental sound TA, DA, TAD, DAD, &c. we have the various terms for *Father* and *Mother*, which pervade so many Languages, (p. 479 and 838,) I shall leave the Theorists to decide, whether the Element DD, TD, &c. was derived from this source. I can only observe, that the Element does not become efficient for the purposes of Language, till it has been referred to actions, which signify 'To DIG up, or about the DUST, &c.'—the TEUT—DEUT, (the Terra,) (Wachter sub vocibus,) the TETH*us*, (Τηθυς, η γη,) טיט TIT, "Mire, Mud, Clay," &c.

The Class C, D, &c. with the Labials M, B, &c. succeeded sometimes by the organical addition of the N or L, as C, D, &c.} M, B, &c.} *n l*, forms another important Elementary Character. The Reader perhaps would in some cases best understand the mode, in which words beginning with different Letters of the Class C, D, &c. pass into each other, if I should consider the first Letter *of the Radical* as expressed by different Letters of this Class, as $\overline{\text{TSC}}h$, $\overline{\text{DSC}}h$, &c, and thus the Elementary Character would be represented by $\overline{\text{TSC}}h$, &c} M, B, &c.} N, L. This process has been explained in a former part of the present Dissertation (22, 23.)—To this Radical belong CAMP*us*, CHAMAI, (Καμαι, Humi,) the Persian ZEMI, ZEMIN, (زمي زمين) *a*DAM, (Heb.) Red Earth, the Sclavonic terms SUMM*es*, ZEM*l*, (Russ.), C*h* THAM*alos*, Χφαμαλος, Humilis,—Kube, (Κυβη,) CYB*ele*, DAP*edon*, (Δαπεδον, Solum,) STAMP, STEP, JUMP, STEIBO, (Στειβο, Calco,) TUPTO, (Τυπτο,) *te*-TUMMAI, (τε τυμμαι,) DOUP*os*, (Δουπος,) DAB, DAUB, DUB, TAP, THUMP, THUMB, (Eng.) TYM*panum*, TABO*ur*, &c.—We see in CAMP*us*, how the form CM passes into CP. I have considered in a former work, the force of the Element CP, &c., in which I have shewn, that a great Race of words exists under this form,

form, which signify "To be Hollow — to contain—comprehend—"infold—inclose," &c. &c. I have in general justly arranged the words which contain this notion, though I have not proceeded to the bottom of the question, nor have I seen the more fundamental idea, from which this notion is derived, and by which it is connected with other races of words, under the same Element not conveying the same sense. I ought to have stated my position after the following manner, and then every thing would have been performed, which the question would admit. The Elementary form CB, CF, &c., signifies "To be *Hollow*—to contain," &c. as derived from the Camp-*us*, *ex*Cav-*atus*, the Kapetos, (Καπετος, Fossa,) the *Ditch*, formed by the action of *Digging*, which under the same Elementary Character is sometimes expressed in Greek and English by Skap*to*, (Σκαπτω, Fodio,) Sap, and Scoop.—To this action of Digging or *Stirring* up the Ground belong the terms expressing the idea of *Stirring up* or *Passing over* a surface, with various degrees of *Violence*—*Agitation*, &c. as Shave, Shape, Sweep,—Shove, Shovel, Chop, &c. We see at once, how Skep*to*, (Σκεπτω, Immitto cum impetu,) attaches itself to Skap*to*, (Σκαπτω.)*

The

* All these words were duly produced, in my former Work; but they were not brought forward, as the important terms, which contained the prevailing Radical idea.—When I was employed in the composition of this Work, I was perfectly aware, that the Earth was the great agent, in supplying the materials of Language, and I there announced my design of considering the Elementary Character ^RT, &c. as denoting the Earth, in my next Volume; but I did not then conceive, that this Fundamental idea could always be discovered, under other Elements, with such precision and effect, as to form a regular arrangement of words, according to the same principle. I was contented therefore to have arrived at one stage, in the Theory of Language, and to have been enabled to discover the Fundamental notion, pervading a Class of words, which belonged to each other, though perhaps an idea still more Fundamental might exist, by which that Class could be connected with other Classes of words, under the same Element, which conveyed different notions. I had seen, in my former Work, that I possessed the means of forming a new System of Languages, in which the words would be arranged in Classes, according to the true Fundamental notion, pervading each Class; and I had seen moreover, that I should sometimes be fortunate enough to apply that ultimate general pervading idea, still more Fundamental, by which all the Classes would be connected

The combination of the Class, C, D, &c. with N, followed sometimes by the Letters of the same Class, with L sometimes appearing as the last Consonant, constitutes another Elementary Character, as C, D, &c.} N} C, D, &c, L. Among the Words of this Element we shall mark the following, T*h*ON, (Χθων, Terra, &c.) KON*is*, (Κονις, Pulvis,) KOIN*os*, (Κοινος,) &c. CŒN*um*, CIN*is*, SENT*ina*, SAND, STONE, SHING*les*, CIND*ers*, SINK, &c. &c. COUNTY, COUN*try*, TOWN, the DN, &c. in the names of places, so universally prevailing, as *Lon*-DON, &c. which Element is particularly visible and distinct in the Chinese Language, as TIEN, a Field, CAN-TON, (which is precisely the same combination as the French CANTON) *Pe*-KIN, *Nan*-KIN, &c.—STAN, (Pers.) *Hindo*-STAN, &c. &c. through the whole compass of Language;—THON, (Germ.) *Mud*, Clay, TUNCH, "Litura e calce, gypso, &c," as Wachter explains it; who in another article has TUNCH, TUNICA, though

---

nected with each other.—I did not however venture to hope, that I should ever be enabled to form such a System as the present, which I have already extended so far and so wide, and which affords, as I trust, such unequivocal testimonies of its efficiency and its extent.—I certainly did not imagine, that I should ever be enabled at once to assume this UNIVERSAL—*Fundamental idea*, this secret master-spring of the whole, as the *first principle* in my System, to which I could readily refer all the other parts in the machinery of Language.

Though in my former Work the words are in general justly arranged in the due order, as belonging to each other; yet I have sometimes mistaken the idea, from which they are more immediately derived. I have supposed, that the *Hand* is an agent of some power in the formation of words, which longer experience induces me to consider as ill founded. There is another misconception likewise, appearing in this Work, which it becomes me to acknowledge, and to correct. I have supposed, that in many words, beginning with SP, as *Speed*, the SP is the Elementary part, which is not so. The S is generally an organical addition to the P, arising sometimes from a notion of *Dispersion—Agitation*, &c. connected with this sound, and the PD is the Radical.—The Reader will at once see, that the mode, in which the arrangements of the preceding Volume were made, however just and precise they may have been, under one point of view, is totally incompatible with the form, which the Work has now assumed, and according to which it will be continued.—I have therefore thought it most expedient to consider the former book as a *Specimen* only of the Elementary doctrine, and the present Volumes as the commencement of a Work on Languages, in which all the parts will be arranged according to the same System.

though he acknowledges no relation between the two words Tunic*a* and Tunch, we now see, belong to the Tunch, the Clay; just as we talk of giving things a *Coating* of Clay. *Coat* belongs to the Element CD, under the same idea; and Cloath is attached to Clod for a similar reason. One single instance in this Element CN will be sufficient to shew, how senses most remote to the idea of Cœn*um* may belong to the lowly matter of Mud. Under the Element CN, &c., we have a great Race of words, through the whole compass of Language relating to *Men*—the Families and Generations of Men—the illustrious *Men*—Powerful Beings, &c.—Names of Men, &c. &c. As King, &c. with its acknowledged parallels Cyng, Cyning, &c. (Sax.) Canning, &c. Keen, &c. *At*Kins, *Ad*Kin, &c. Khan, (Eastern,) Cohen, (Heb.) the Priest—the Arabic Jins, or the Gen*ii*, the Chinese Jin, a Man, Gen*us*, Gen*ero*, Gens, &c. (Lat.) Gi*nomai*, &c. &c. (Γι*νομαι*,) Kin, Kind, Son, Kind, (Germ.) a Child, Infant, &c. &c. Now the origin of all these terms appears in the word Kind, a Species, Sort, or as we might express it, *Matter, Materials*: A thing of the same Kind is a thing formed or consisting of the same *Matter* or *Materials*; and we all see, that *Matter* and *Materials* may belong to *Mud*. The idea of Kind, *Sort*, or *Matter*, is applied to a Person of an *illustrious* Kind, as King, Cyning, &c. precisely as Gent*leman* and Gen*erous*, Gen*crosus*, &c. are acknowledged to belong to Gen*us*. Through the whole compass of Language the Element CN, &c. expresses Sort or Kind. The Arabic term will be sufficient for our purpose جنس Jins, which Mr. Richardson explains by "A Gen*us*, species, Kind, sort, "mode—A Gen*eration*, family, of the same stock.—Goods, moveables "(any estate not in money,)" in which latter sense, we see the idea of Household *Stuff*, as we call it. The Sun with its parallels Sonne, (Germ.), &c. has been acknowledged by some to belong to the German Schon, Fair, Fine, &c. Scheinan, to Shine, &c. In the verb belonging to Schon, we have the true idea, annexed to all these words. Watchter explains Schon*en* by "Ornare, *purgare*, polire, mundum "et tersum reddere, quocunque modo id fiat." The sense of *Purgare*, To Clear away *Dirt*, will shew us, that Schon*en* means 'To remove 'the Cœn*um*, *Mud*, or *Dirt*.' In an ancient version of St. Matthew, and

quoted by Wachter, the word is brought to its humble and original station, the Ground; "Besmon gacherit enti gaSchon*it*, *Scopis* mun-"datum et Purgatum." I have shewn (page 28,) that Sol belongs to Cl*ear*, Cl*ean*, Cl*arus*, &c., and that these words are derived from the idea of Cl*eaning* off the Clay or *Dirt*. Thus, then, Son is an object of the same Kin—Kind, or *Matter* with another; and the Sun is the Shin*ing* — Clear—Fair object, from which *Matter* or *Foul Matter* is removed. Thus it is, be assured, my good Reader! that Languages have been formed.

When the Labials precede the Class C, D, &c. with L sometimes following, we have the Elementary Characters M}C, D, &c. L, B, &c.}C, D, &c. L. Though the words in these Classes perpetually connect themselves with each other, yet I shall consider that Elementary Character, in which M is the first letter, separately from that, in which the other Labials are the first Radical Consonants. I shall do this, not only because the Words in both Classes are too abundant to be considered together, but because the M seems to be somewhat distinguished from the other Labials, as I have before observed, (p. 18.) I shall open a great world of secrets indeed to the view of him, who ardently enquires into the mysteries of Language, when I inform him, that all the ideas annexed to the Elementary Character MD, &c. will be found in our term MUD. We shall in a moment call to mind such words, which directly associate themselves with MUD, &c., as Muck, To Mute, Mist, Matter, Mat*eria*, Mac*us*, (Lat.) Mix, Misc*eo*, Mig*nuo*, (Μιγνυω,) Moist, Mad*eo*, Mud*ao*, (Μυδαω,) Massa, Mass, Mash, Mac*erate*, Mac*ero*, Masso, (Μασσω, Pinso, subigo,) &c. These words will almost lead us through the different ideas annexed to the whole Element. The universality of the term Mud will be understood, when we remember the name of Ægypt, Mis=*Ram* or Mas*ar*, which we shall own to be justly called the Land of Mud; and recollect moreover, that *Sanconiathon* has made the first principle of all things to be Mot, which some, as he tells us, consider to be Mud. Bochart explains the doctrine thus: "In ipso operis exordio legas "statim initio rerum fuisse πνοην αερος ζοφωδους, tenebrosi aeris spi-"ritum, quem appellat Χαος ερεβωδες.—Sequitur ex conversione "spiritus cum Chao emersisse Μωτ, Mot; id est, *Limum* aut *aquosæ* "*mixtionis*

" *mixtionis putredinem* : Και εκ της αυτου συμπλοκης του πνευματος " εγενετο ΜΩΤ. Τουτο τινες φασιν ιλυν, οι δε υδατωδους μιξεως " σηψιν.—Και εκ ταυτης εγενετο πασα σπορα κτισεως, και γενεσις " ολων. Et hinc factum est omne creaturarum seminium et omnium " generatio." (*Geograph. Sac.* lib. II. c. 2.)

To this Deity Mot, or rather to this Matter of Mud, must be referred the Grecian Maia or Maja, the Mother of *Mercury*, who is perhaps quasi Mac*ur;*—the mystic personage among the Druids Math, "a mighty operator with the magic wand, who at the time " of the Deluge, set the *Elements* at large," says Mr. Davies, (*Mythology of the Druids*, p. 451,) who has very justly described this personage on another occasion, to have been "the universal genius of " nature, which discriminated all things, according to their various " kinds, or species—the same perhaps as the Meth of the Ægyptians, " and the Μητις," Met*is*, "of the Orphic Bards, which was of *all* " *kinds*, and the author of *all things*.—Και Μητις πρωτος γενετωρ " Orph. Frag." (*Celtic Researches*, p. 285.) There is another mystic personage among the Druids, of the same family, called Amath-*aon*, which Mr. Davies has derived from Math, "Kind, species, and *honi*, " to discriminate." To these terms belong the well-known Deities Budda and Amida. If the modern Greeks were required to write Budda, it would appear under the form Mbudda. The Fo of the Chinese is acknowledged to be the Fod or Budda of the Eastern world, and the Mercury of the Greeks. The Chinese Language differs in nothing from all other Languages but in this particular, that in general it does not adopt the second Letter of the Radical, which other nations possess; and hence they are reduced to such vile shifts, as explaining their meaning by a still viler character, made with their hands, &c., or by singing, in order to distinguish their Fo, Fa, &c. from each other; all which distinctions other nations effect by the addition of the Letters in the Class C, D, &c., as Fod, Budda, &c. Sometimes however it is retained, and hence the Deity is called Poota, Amida, Omeeto, &c. A passage in Mr. Barrow's Travels into China is so applicable to this point, that I cannot forbear producing it. "The Budha of the Hindus was the son of Maya, and one of

" his

" his epithets is AMITA. The *Fo* of China was the son of *Mo-ya*, and " one of his epithets is *Om-e-to*; and in Japan, whose natives are of " Chinese origin, the same god *Fo* is worshipped under the name of " AMIDA. I could neither collect from any of the Chinese what the " literal meaning was of *Om-e-to*, nor could I decypher the charac- " ters under which it was written," &c. (p. 468.) The same writer observes in another place, that the priests of *Fo* or BUDHA, "live in a " state of celibacy in large convents or temples, which the Chinese call " *Poo-ta-la*, evidently derived from BUDHA-*Laya*, or habitation of " BUDHA, this name being adopted by the Tartars, which the Chinese " have been under the necessity of following as nearly as their organs " of speech would permit." (p. 469.) The BUDHA or POTA *La* or *Laya* is literally the *Layer* of BUDHA—the place where BUDHA *Lies* or *Lays*, or is situated. The Chinese in most cases and the Hindoos in this case, have done precisely with the Element LG, to Lie, *Lecgan*, (Sax.) *Legen*, (Germ.) as the English have done in the present instance, who in their pronunciation have lost the last Letter of the Radical; and if the English had always done the same, their Language would have been as inefficient and unfurnished as the Chinese, which is probably the most vile and abortive attempt at Human Speech, now extant under the Sun, especially in its more cultivated state, accompanied by the profound artifices of their profound and learned *Illiterati*. The sound of the second Radical in this word is however preserved in other Nations, as among the Teutonic tribes, the Latins and Greeks, *Lego*, To gather *Legoo*, (Γεγω, Lego, Colligo, Λεγομαι, Cubo, jacco,) which both mean, To *Lay* together, or, *col*LECT, and in Greek the term signifies moreover 'To *Lie* down,' as in its kindred LE*chos*, (Λεχος,) and the Latin LECTUS, the place of *Lying* down, the *Layer*, *Litter*, &c.

The name of AMAD*is* belongs to the Saint or the Deity AMIDA; and I suspect, that the Tale conveyed originally a Mythological meaning, as it has happened in various other cases, as in the story of *Sir Tristrem*, &c. &c. It is acknowledged in the History, that AMAD*is* was a sacred name. "Darioleta took ink and parchment, and wrote " upon it, this is AMADIS, son of a King. It was the name of her " *Saint*

"*Saint*, and of *great reverence* in that country." The name of the Father of AMADIS, we know, is *Perion*, and I cannot help adding, that a Prince, under this name, is the chief personage in a transaction, belonging to the greatest physical event, which ever happened on the face of our Globe. Nay, what is still more extraordinary, this event is connected with the Plastic materials of MUD or Clay, and is recorded even by the Chinese themselves, the worshippers of AMIDA. I shall leave this secret to be unravelled by our great adepts in Mythology.

The OMET, or the MUT, &c. again appears among the Greeks in their illustrious personage *Pr*-OMETH-*eus*, who is actually employed, as we know, in the work of *Creation* with the very Materials of MUD or Clay. He is likewise supposed to be the same as MAG*og*, who is conceived by some to have been a great worker in Clay—Bricks, &c., and the Builder of the Wall of Tartary. Words are propagated in the fables of Mythology, as they are in the ordinary processes of Language. They always contain the same *Fundamental idea*, though they are applied to different modes of action—to different purposes, and different persons. We now shall understand that *Prometheus*, the MET, or OMET is the MAK*er* of IMAG*es* from MUD, or Clay; and hence we shall learn, that MAKE and *i*MAG*e*, terms relating to shape or form, are derived from the same spot, and belong to the same Plastic MATT*er* of MUD, or *Clay*. Among the Celtic terms for *Forma* in Lhuyd, I find MODH, MATH, IMASH, MADH, from whence we may shrewdly suspect, that Mos, MOD*us*, MODE means nothing but *shape* and *form*, and still belong to the plastic MUD. — Thus it is, that "there are more things in Heaven and Earth, than are dreamt of in "our philosophy."—I was desirous of producing one single example from the stores of Mythology, that the Reader may understand, how utterly feeble and inefficient must be all our attempts to unravel the mysteries of the ancient World, in their Fables and their Names; unless the Master-Key of the Elementary Doctrine has been deposited in our hands.

The union of the other Labials with the Class C, D, &c. as B, F, &c.} C, D, &c. L, forms an Elementary Character, which I shall consider in a separate discussion, though it perpetually coincides with

the form M D. It refers to the Ground in general, but chiefly to the *Soft*—Plastic, Lumpy—or swelling appearance of *Mud* or objects of that kind,—to the *Low, Muddy* Spot—to *Mud* in agitation by Treading on it—by Splashing, or reducing to *Mud*, Dirt, &c. so as to disperse—Dissipate—Destroy, as an action of Violence. We may obtain a sufficient idea of the sense annexed to the Element by the following terms, PUDGE, *Hodge*=PODGE, BOG, PUDDLE, BOTCH, BATCH, PASTE, PUDDING, FAT, POTTAGE, PACHUS, (Παχυς,) PUTH*er*, BOTH*er*, sPHODR*os*, (Σφοδρος, &c. &c.—POTTER, FIG*ulus*, FIG*ura*, FAC*io*, ΠΟΙ*εο*, (Ποιεο,) quasi PO*Jeo*, FASH*ion*, FEAT*ure*, VAS, VESS*el*, &c.—POT, PITCH*er*, BAS*on*, BOTT*le*, &c. PAYS, (Fr.) PEAS*ant*, &c. BODEN, BOTTOM, PEDO*n*, (Πεδον,) FOSS*a*, (Lat.) *a*BYSS, BUTH*os*, (Βυθος,) PIT, BASE, VASS*al*, BAD, &c. PEJ*or*, PESS*imus*, (Lat.), &c.—PAT, PIT=PAT, PASS, PAD, VAD*o*, BADIZ*o*, (Βαδιζω,) *Baino* quasi BA*Jno*, (Βαινω,) PAT*eo*, (Πατεω, Calco,) FOOT, POUS, POD-*os*, (Πους, ποδος,) &c. &c. PA*Tasso*, (Πατασσω, Cum strepitu palpito, ferio) PITUL*os*, (Πιτυλος, Strepitus, qualis præsertim aquæ remo percussæ,) PADDLE, &c. PASH, ("Death all to *dust* PASHED,") POSH, PUSH, and BEAT—(To BEAT the Ground) BATT*re*, (Fr.), &c. &c.—The Reader will in general find little difficulty with the words under the Element BD, &c. when these terms shall have been diligently considered.

I shall now examine the Labials, when they exhibit themselves as the Elementary Characters, either alone, with or without the breathing before the ^M, ^B, &c. or combined, with a Vowel breathing between them, with L or N, sometimes as the last Consonant. This Element may be represented by ^M, ^B, &c.} L, N, or M}, M, B,} L, N, &c. It has afforded the name for *Father*, and *Mother*, *Man — Woman*, &c. *Being*, &c. through a great variety of Languages, PA, MA, PAPA, MAMA, &c. &c., and has been supposed to be derived from the Infantine Sounds, made by the Lips of Infants, MA—MA, &c. (See page 278, &c.) It is supposed moreover to have formed much of the materials of Human Speech.—I have no objection at all to this hypothesis, when considered after a certain manner, and to a certain extent; as I think, that I perceive terms, under these sounds, which may seem directly to conduct us to such an origin. The extent however, to which this influence proceeds it is difficult or rather impossible to

to adjust; and here as in all other cases we must come to the *Earth*, as the spot, from which the great body of terms, appearing under this Element, receive their force. If we suppose the name of *Mother* to have been the original idea; we shall directly see, how aptly such a term would be applied to the *Earth*, and so intimate is this connexion, that the union perpetually appears in the same terms, Δημητηρ, &c. and in the allusions of the Poet:

Common Mother, thou,
" Whose Womb unmeasurable, and infinite breast,
" Teems and feeds all."

In Greek Amm*a*, (Αμμα,) means at once the *Mother* and the great Mother of all, the *Earth*, (p. 279); and among other names, relating to the Ground, under this Element, we must reckon the following, Hum*i*, Im*us*, Oim*e*, (Οιμη, Via) Amm*os*, (Αμμος, Arena,) Omp*ai*, Omp*nia*, (Ομπνη, Fruges, Ομπαι, Fruges, Ομπνιος, Almus, ut Ομπνια Δημητηρ, Alma Ceres,) Emp*anda*, Ceres, Am*æa*, a name of Ceres among the Trœzenians, Ap*ia*, (Απια, Scythis dicitur Tellus,) Obe, (Οβη, Tribus,) Uim, (Irish,) the Earth, Home, Ham, as in the names of Towns, *Notting*-Ham, &c. Am the verb of situation or being, Hab*eo*, the verb of Possession, &c. (p. 283.) The Element ^M, ^V, &c. supplies the great name for Water in the Eastern Languages, as Abb, Auv, Ma, Ab=Aub, Im, &c., and in other forms of Speech:—Hence we have Humor—Amn*is*, Avon, *w*Ave, the French Eau quasi Eav, the old word Ave (Eng.) Eaves of a House, &c. &c.—Under this Element we have the idea of objects Rising or Swelling up, over, about, either simply, or sometimes as if rising from a source or origin, and sometimes under the idea of *Agitation—Commotion*, &c. as Up, Over, Off, Hop, Hover, Abo-ve, Ab-*out*, Hump*h*, Heap, Heave, Hebes, Ab, Apo, (Απο,) Upo, (Υπο,) where we have the Base or Bottom, (Amp*hi*,) (Αμφι,) Hem, Amb*actus*, Aip*us*, (Αιπυς,) Up*selos*, (Υψηλος,) &c. &c. To this Element belong names of Noise Hum, Hub-*Bub*, Humble Bee, &c. The Combination in BM, PP gives us the same sense as the simple form, such as we see in Bump, &c. Bomos, (Βωμος,) Puff, Pap, Pop, &c. *Sylla*-Bub, *Hub*-Bub, Pipe, Pip*io*, (Lat.) Bumble *Bee*, Bomb*eo*, (Βομβεω,) Bubble, Babble, &c. In Sanscrit Boom-*Daivie* is the Goddess of the *Earth*—Boob*uns*, the Worlds.—In Gipsey Poov is the Earth.—

Earth. We see, how *k*-Umi appears to connect itself with *ch*-Amai, and Ammos, (Αμμος,) with *ps*-Ammos, (Ψαμμος, Arena,) and this might lead us to enquire, whether the Element s}M was not derived from the simpler form ^M. On this point I can supply no opinion; and I have only to observe, that the Element S}M exhibits a Race of words, very different to that, which appears under the form ^M.

The form N}M, B, &c. may be considered as belonging to different Elementary Characters, as to ^N and to ^M, by attraction of the organical M, as a postfix, N}M, or of the organical N as a prefix, N}M. The N}M is often connected with the form *k*N}M, or KN}M, P, as Nepios, (Νηπιος,) with *k*Nave, or *k*Nabe, (Germ.) a Boy. It sometimes likewise happens, that NM is connected with the form D}B, as we must remember, that the Welsh in some cases use N for D, as *ei Dhuw*, his God; *fy Nuw*, my God; and thus we see, how Numen may be another form of Divus and Divinus, Nimbus of Divum, &c. This Element is of too complicated a nature to admit of a brief explanation. It is necessary to observe, that the form N}C, &c. with a vowel breathing between the two Consonants, and not appearing before the *N*, belongs to ^NC and KN}c, or *k*N}c, &c.

The Elementary form with the Labials before the N, as M, B, &c.}N, may be considered as frequently connected with the form M, B, &c.}C, &c., though it constitutes a separate Element. The connection of these forms familiarly appears, as in Fingo, Fixi, Fictus, Pango, *pe*Pigi, Pactum, &c. The sense of the Element will be seen in such words which denote the *Muddy* spot, or something belonging to the Muddy, Watery spot, as Fango, (Ital.) Mire, Dirt, Pond, Fen, (Eng.) Fundus, the Bottom, &c. The Hindoo and Gipsey Paune, Water, Fons, Pons, (Lat.) the Rising-up Heap of *Mud* or *Dirt*, as Bank, &c. serving for a Mound, Boundary, Fence, Finis, &c. We see, that Mundus, the World, is nothing but the Mound; and hence we have the Latin Mons, Mænia, the Eastern Minnarets, the Celtic terms for the Rising Hill, the Top, &c. Pen, &c. Bounos, (Βουνος, collis, tumulus, clivus, acervus,) Bun, &c. (Eng.) Mundus, Clean, is derived from the action of clearing out the Dirt, by which the Mundus or Mound is made, ab *c*Mundando, Fossam, Mungendo,

MUNG*endo*, *e*MUNG*endo*, &c. The Element is applied to signify the *Soft*, tender form of *Infants*, *Children*, &c.; and hence the very word *in*FANS, *in*FANT, the Eastern BEN in BEN-*jamin*, &c. &c.; and hence we have the Celtic BEAN, the Woman. In the Eastern Languages, the names for *Son*, &c. בנה BNH, is connected with that of Building, or BANK*ing* up; and we see likewise the idea of "The form, pattern, "model," in which we are brought to the original sense of *Plastic materials*. Hence under MN we have such terms as *Mens*, *Mind*, *Meaning*, *Mien*, *Menuo*, (Μηνυω,) &c. &c. In the adjective MEAN we have the vile *Dirt*, and in the verb *Mean* and substantive *Mien*, we have its plastic form. In Welsh, MEN*u* is "To make an *impression*, "to *imprint*, to work upon, to effect," and MEN*w* is "Intellect, "MIND or SOUL," as Mr. Owen explains these words, who refers us to MAN, signifying among other things, "A *Spot* or *Mark*," the adjacent words to which are MAN, "Small, little, petty fine; MAN*ad*, "a *Mass*, *Lump*," from whence we shall understand, that MIN*uo*, MIN*utus*, MIN*uos*, (Μινυος, Parvus,) MIN*ute*, &c. &c. relate only to little pieces of *Dirt*. We may have seen perhaps with eyes of joy the liquor MANTLING in the goblet; yet we were little aware, I imagine, from what a lowly, or rather from what a foul spot this joyous term has been derived. We shall however instantly acknowledge its humble origin, when we cast our eyes on "The green MANTLE of the "standing *Pool*," and remember, that "There are a sort of men, "whose visages do cream and MANTLE like a standing *Pond*." (*Lear*, *Othello*.)

I have already unfolded the important Elementary form GV}L}c, &c. B, &c. L, N, and shewn, how it resolves itself into the parts C &c.}L}c, &c. B, &c. L, N, B, &c.}L}c, &c. B, &c. L, N, (p. 26, 27.) Among the words relating to Dirt, under the form C, &c.}L}c, &c. B, &c. L, N, &c. we have seen the terms CLAY, CLOD, CHALK, SLATE, SILEX, CHALIX, (Χαλιξ,) CALX, SLUDGE, SLUSH, SLIME, LIMUS, LIME, LUMP, CLAMP, GLOBE, GLEBE, SLOP, SLIP, SLIDE, SLITHER, GLIDE, &c. I have shewn, how all the forms, in which L appears, may directly pass into each other. Still however, the forms, in which the

C, &c.

C, &c. appears before the L, and the Labials B, &c. appears before it, will be treated separately, and even the various parts of each form will be examined in different divisions of my Work, as Sol*um*, Soil, &c. Tell*us*, Till, Toil, Tool, Tollo, (Lat.) &c.

I shall consider the Labial form M}L}&c. as more peculiarly distinct from the other Labial forms, according to the observations, which I have before made on the property of the Labial M, (p. 18.) Under ML we at once remember Mould, Mullock, &c., and we see in Mould, Form, Shape, how that idea is attached to the Plastic materials of the *Earth*. We shall see under this Element ML, Races of words, denoting what is *Soft—Sweet*, &c., and likewise actions of great violence and power, as signifying 'To reduce in a Mould state —In pulverem *Redigere*—Subigere.' Hence we have Mel, Mel*i*, (Μελι,) Moll*is*, Mild, Mal*asso*, Meil*isso*, (Μαλασσω, Mollio, placo, Μειλισσω, Demulceo,) Mulc*eo*, *Pell*-Mell, Mawl, Mill, Mola, *a*Mal*os*, *a*Mald*uno*, (Αμαλος, Mollis, Αμαλδυνω, Corrumpo, ut Molle, Demolior, everto, solo æquo,) the Eastern name for a King, Malek, from whence Moloch is derived;—*de*-Mol*ior*, *de*Mol*ish*, Mol*ior*, To Moil and Toil, "Dum cultores agri altius Moliantur Terram, "*Plough* it deeper," says R. Ainsworth. Under the Element B, &c.}L}&c. I have already produced, (p. 60,) some examples, as Bol*os*, Bel*os*, Ballo, (Βωλος, Gleba, Ager, Massa, *Bolus*, Βηλος, Limen domus vel templi, quod calcatur, Βαλλω, Jacio,) where we have the Dirt and its Agitation, Balk, the Furrow; Pel*os*, (Πηλος, Limus,) Pol*eo*, (Πολεω, Aro,) to Plough, &c. &c. Volvo, Vol*uto*, Wallow, &c. with the metaphorical application of these terms, as in Boul*euomai*, (Βουλευομαι, Consilia Agito,) 'To *re*Volve a thing in the mind.' I dare not venture to entangle myself in the consideration of these Elementary characters, so abundant in terms and ideas; yet the most superficial glance over Languages will directly shew us, how words are connected with this source. We shall immediately call to mind the terms of *Violence*, *Agitation*, &c., which belong to the idea of Plough*ing* or *Stirring* up the Pel*os*, Bol*os*, (Πηλος, Βωλος,) as Pull, Pluck, Vello, Vellico, Violo, Viol*ent*, Pell-*Mell*, Pallo,

PALLO, (Παλλω, Vibro, Agito,) PEEL, PILLAGE, PELT, &c. Hence we have the terms of abundance, as Dirt in Heaps, POL*us*, (Πολυς,) FULL, PL*enus*; and hence the FOUL VILE matter, &c.

Thus have I arranged in the most brief and cursory manner the different Elementary Characters, and I have likewise shewn, whenever the case would admit, the prevailing and predominating ideas, which those Elements convey. Though no explanation can be more concise than this detail on a subject of such vast extent; it must not however be considered as superficial; and brief as it is, it may save perhaps to the enquirers into Language whole years,—I might venture to say, even ages of misapplied and unsuccessful meditation on this involved and mysterious subject. I certainly may be permitted to make this declaration, when I freely unfold the painful operations of my own mind on the same enquiry. When I now cast my eyes over Human Speech, with the result before me, which I have just unfolded to the Reader; nothing appears so plain and so obvious as the facts, which I have stated; and the words of Language seem to attach themselves to these ideas, with the greatest facility and readiness. Yet I must observe likewise, that years of ardent and incessant meditation have passed away, before I was enabled to form those results, which are here stated; brief as they are in the narrative, and easy, as they may appear, in the discovery. The words, under an Elementary Character, were all involved in obscurity and confusion; until the Fundamental idea, and the leading notions proceeding from it, had been fully discovered. The Reader is not to imagine, that he will at once perceive in every word, belonging to a certain Element, some one of the prevailing ideas, which I have attributed to it; or that the discovery of the connection between the senses of a word and some one of these prevailing ideas is, in all cases, a task easy to be performed. He will not fail however to understand, from what a mighty labour he has been freed in the course of his researches. He has been supplied with the *Fundamental idea*, to which his words are ultimately to be referred; and he has been or will be furnished with the leading senses, into which this Fundamental idea resolves itself, under certain Elements, or in its general operation. He has nothing to do then but

but to study with diligence the various senses of his word, and to discover that peculiar bearing of meaning, under which it attaches itself to the Fundamental idea. In the present Volumes the Elements ^R, ^R}c, &c. L, N, and ^C, ^D, &c. are examined. The other Elementary Characters will be considered in future Volumes of my Work, if a few years of life and hard-earned health should permit the Writer to pursue his labours with the same industry and ardor, which he has hitherto exerted in the study of Languages. The Elementary Character ^M, M}C, D, &c.—B, &c.}C, D, &c.—C, &c.}M, &c. are already arranged in manuscript, and wait only for that persuasive or imperious call, which authors so willingly obey in the demands of a kind and a curious Public. The future Volumes might be dispatched with more brevity, according to the model, which I have exhibited in considering the forms ^R and ^R}M, B, &c. if I should discover, that the judgment of learned and intelligent men was favourable to that method. In the first opening of my Work, I considered it at once just and becoming to detail the acknowledged parallel terms produced by the Etymologists, together with their opinions on the subject, that the Reader might be fully possessed with all the popular information on the question, and be enabled to judge between the performance of the past, and the pretensions of the present. When this matter shall have been sufficiently decided; the writer may then pursue his own course according to his own plan; and a few Volumes would comprise some of the most important facts, relating to the other Elementary characters; if the method, to which I have alluded, should be adopted throughout the whole Work*.

I shall

---

* Whenever we turn our view to the *Theory* of Language, and attempt to discuss those parts of Human Speech, which we may suppose to have existed before Language appeared; we must not wonder, that the mind should be lost and confounded in its enquiries. In considering the Elementary characters ^M, MR, MD, we see the idea of Soft, Watery substances, MIRE—MUD; and thus the Theorists might suppose, that the Liquid M, as the Grammarians call it, was the original Radical germ, according to the phraseology of some writers, from which these forms were derived. If the matter be considered

I shall now proceed to the second portion of the discussion, which was proposed to be unfolded in this division of the third Section. I shall

---

considered under this point of view, these different Elementary forms might be represented by ^M, M} R, C, &c. If we add the other forms, in which the Labials appear first, with R, C, &c. following, as B} R, B} C, &c., denoting likewise the *Soft* Substance, as BOR-BOR-*os*, (Βορβορος, Limus;) the Theorist might say, that the incipient Germ of all these forms exists in the Labials M, B, &c., and that the general representation might be ^M, ^B, M, B, &c.} R, C, &c. N. I have no objection to this Theory; and I seem to observe, that the power of M appears to predominate in various words, under these forms, as if the M should be considered as the original Elementary sound, from which the others were derived. We may suppose, if we please, too, that the sound of *M* originally belonged to the Infantine Language, MA, PA, &c., from which it was applied to other objects, as the MIRE, &c. If this should be the case, what shall we do with M, considered under the principle of Onomatopœia, as in HUM, &c.? Children form PA and MA, from the necessity of the organs, but men form Words from the principle of *Onomatopœia*, if that principle be true, from choice. Shall we say, then, that both causes have operated in the formation of words, beginning with the Labials? We have seen, that ^R is a predominating Radical; and such undoubtedly it is. How shall we consider then the forms MR, BR, in which we have introduced two *Prevailing* Elements or Germs, M, B, &c. and R? Shall we say, that the Element MR, BR, in its nascent state, may be sometimes considered as a compound, in which the force of both the Elements was impressed on the speaker—that in other cases, the R was sometimes an organical addition to the prevailing Labial M, &c., and the Labial M, &c. sometimes an organical accidental accretion to the R. We have seen, that the ^L is a great Elementary character, and so it must undoubtedly be considered; and it is accompanied likewise by those laws, which I have before described. But I have no objection to any Theory, which may pretend to give a solution for the existence of those Laws. Shall we say, that QV} ^L is formed from an impression of the force, annexed to QV and L, on the principle of Onomatopœia? The L is called a Liquid, and it certainly appears to exert its influence most in expressing *Soft Substances*. Thus, then, the forms M, B, &c.} L, may be considered as compounds in which the impressions of both sounds, the Labial and the Liquid, passed over the mind of the speaker. By the original nature or use of the organs an aptitude has been acquired of combining these sounds, and when this is done without any impression of the force of the Labial on the mind of the speaker, the union of the Labial with the Liquid may be called *organical*, as I have called it, without embarrassing myself with a case, about which I know nothing. This imaginary or real force of QV on the mind might be represented by the term QUAG in QUAG-*Mire*. Shall we say, then, that the Elementary character C} C, or Q} Q, is derived from the impression of *QU*, or Q, as we see it in QUAG. The TA,

I shall recall to the remembrance of the Reader some of the acknowledged and familiar examples, in which the EARTH and its *Operations*—

TAT, the Infantine Language, may be a separate appendage to CC. For the same reason, that the Labials precede the L in expressing *Soft* Substances, so will they follow the L, as *Limus*, *Labi*, *Slime*, *Slip*. Now the *S* is supposed to have a force, by which it imparts to Words an idea of *Dispersion—Scattering*; and hence it is, if we so please to say, that *S* appears before and after the L, as in SL*ime*, SL*uSh*, &c. Shall we say, that the *Labials* and the *Liquid* L, were originally applied to the Earth; as denoting the *Soft* Substances of MUD, LIMUS, &c. &c., that the accretions to these Elementary Letters were partly on the principle of Onomatopœia from design, and partly from accident dependant on the Organs or organical.—Thus in *Mish-Mash*, MISCEO we may hear, if we please, the compound of M and S, such as I have stated.—Shall we suppose then, that the union of S with ^R is of a compound nature, on the principle of Onomatopœia, *h*-IRR, *h*-ARSH, and that it exists as an independant Radical, denoting *Dispersion—Agitation*, *Noise*, as in HISS, OOZE—the terms for *Water Wasser*, &c. In *WaSSer* we might imagine a compound to exist of the Labial and the S. Shall we imagine that the Element S } M is a compound of S and M, on the same Principle, as in *Swamp*, &c. Thus then if we please, the ^R, ^M, B, &c. ^L, may be considered as the original Elements, or Letters, from which the great Elementary Characters, such as I have stated, have been formed, by accretion, as of S, QV, &c. In the QV we have the important sound, by which the Labials pass into the Guttural. That is, if any Theorist wishes to maintain, that L, CL, SL, QV } L, have attached themselves to such terms as IL*us*, ιλυς, *Limus*, *Lutum*, CL*ay*, GWALT, GLEBA, &c. on the principle of Onomatopœia, as expressing a substance of a *Smooth—Soft—Smeary*—OILY, UL*iginous*, nature, as something "thick and SLAB," as something on which men often move GLIB*ly*, or on which they SLIP, SLIDE, or when considered in a more watery state, attended with *Agitation* and *Noise*, as something SLOPPY—as something all in a SLUSH—all PLA*shing* or sPLA*shing* about; if I say, any Theorist wishes to make this position, I can have no objection whatever to his Hypothesis. Our Theorist has then obtained every thing, which he proposes, and I shall have gained every thing, which I am desirous of possessing. He has a term existing from *Onomatopœia*, to which only he looks,—from which he has drawn no consequence, and from which he can draw no consequence, till it is considered under one certain point of view, to which he has never once directed his mind, even in the remotest conception.—I have obtained, by the benefit of this Onomatopœia, if it has indeed thus operated, a term for the Earth—for CLAY, GWALT, &c. to which alone I direct my attention—which I consider alone as the important part of the business, and from which, after the adoption of a few principles, I am enabled to discover innumerable facts, which are to be found through the whole compass of Human Speech. I can therefore have no objection to this or any other opinion, not repugnant to my Hypothesis,

about

rations—Accidents, &c. has been found to exert their influence in the formation of words and ideas.—We shall all understand, as I before observed, what an abundant source of ideas the *Earth* would supply, if we contemplate only in a superficial manner the most familiar and apparent of the various *Accidents—Operations—Properties*, &c. &c. attached to it. Among these *Accidents—Operations—Properties*, &c. are those, as I before remarked, which belong to the action of *Stirring it up.—Scratching it up—Tearing it up—Routing it up—Scraping—Grating* upon it, &c. with various degrees of *Agitation—Commotion—Noise*, &c. in various modes and manners, by the feet—hands—instruments of men, &c.—by the feet—snout—claws of animals, &c. by wind, water, &c. &c. *Digging—Ploughing—Harrowing—Raking—Treading Stamping — Stepping — Walking— Drawing, Dragging*; as likewise those, expressing the various objects to be found on or near its surface, with their state—form—consistency, &c. as *Dirt, Dust, Mud, Muck, Mould, Mullock, Stone, Sand, Grit, Soil, Clay, Chalk, Slime, Slop, Slush, Clod, Clump, Lump, Glebe, Globe, Bog, Podge, Pudge, Puddle. Rough, Smooth, Hard, Solid, Soft, Wet, Dry, Moist*, &c. We shall all,

---

about the nascent processes, by which the objects of my discussion have been formed.—Some obscure notions of this sort, on the power of the Letters, M, L, &c. have always prevailed, and such notions commonly contain the "adumbrata," if not the "expressa "signa veritatis."—These impressions of the force of Letters and sounds, as formed on the principle of *Onomatopœia* still exist and are still applied, either as derived from facts now remaining, which were originally the effects of accident, or as really attached to the nature of things. I have introduced these minute points, because the Reader may expect some discussion of this sort, and may be desirous of knowing, how the ordinary opinions on this subject, idle and unproductive, as they may be, accord with the new doctrines, maintained in my Hypothesis.—I must again and again repeat, that these processes, whether true or false, have nothing at all to do, with the *facts*, which are here produced.—If they could be proved to be true, they would not assist us, by their own value, in discovering a single *Fact* in the various relations of Words to each other.—I speak only of Language as it *now* appears, and is *visible* to our view; when it is capable of being an object of discussion, when the great Elementary Characters have been formed, such as I have supposed them, propagating separate Classes of words by their own power, though occasionally passing into each other, and attached to the *Spot*, from which they derive all their force and all their efficiency.

all, I think, agree, that the Words, which express objects and actions, such as I have enumerated, would be connected with the EARTH; or that Races of words, expressing these objects and actions, centering in the same spot, the *Earth*, would be related to each other, according to the laws attached to the organs, by which this relation is permitted—performed—and preserved.—According to these Laws, then, which have been so fully explained, SOL*um*, SOIL, SOL*idus*, CL*ay*, CH*alk*, &c. would belong to each other—MUD, MUCK, MOIST, MASS, would belong to each other, and so of the rest.

The Author is embarrassed amidst such materials of observation, which the whole Work is intended to unfold; when he attempts to select some peculiar topics for the purpose of a brief illustration. That material objects and actions should belong to *Matter* we shall all agree; and it has been perpetually said, that words, expressing abstract ideas, mental operations, &c. have been derived from *Material* objects; and yet with these obvious truths, universally acknowledged, and perpetually repeated, the *Matter* of the EARTH has never been selected, as the important or only agent, to which all these operations are to be attributed.—Where is *Matter* to be found but in the EARTH? Did man mount up into the Skies for these *material* objects, or did he seek for Matter in his own Limbs or those of other animals? All other *Matter* exists in, on, or arises from the Matter of the EARTH.—Let us first consider into what various ideas the *Soft Matter* of the *Earth* extends itself. —That MOLL*is* may belong to the Soft MOULD we shall all agree, as it does belong to *Soft Substances*; and the various senses, to which the idea of *Soft* may be applied, we shall learn from the familiar and well known senses of MOLL*is*, which according to that authentic interpreter, R. Ainsworth, signifies, "Soft, Pliant, flexible, "Calm, gentle, temperate, *Mild*, exorable.—Easy, facile, plain.—"Sweet, pleasant, delightful—Weak, tender effeminate, womanish, "wanton, amorous; flashy.—Soft, easy, natural, done to the life.—"Smooth tasted. Mellow, ripe. Lazy, restive."—We shall all agree, I must again repeat, that MOLL*is* may belong to MOULD, and if it does, we shall likewise agree, that MOULD may indeed be applied to a great variety of purposes. Let us note the explanatory English terms

terms MELLOW and MILD, which belong to the same race of words. It will now be understood, that MOLL*is* is applied in its original sense, as relating to the MOULD*ing* of plastic materials, in the following passage, where the use of the word has been thought somewhat extraordinary, "Excudent alii spirantia MOLLUIS æra. — As *Mellow*, belongs to MOULD, so does MA*turus*, to MUD.

We shall all agree likewise, that the idea of *Stirring up* may belong to the *Agitation* of *Dirt*, *Pulverem Excitare*; and thus MOL*ior* might belong to MOULD, as MOLL*is* may. But whether it does or not, it is certainly applied to the action, of *Stirring* up MOULD, as MOL*iri* '*Terram*, To *Plough*,' and the sense of *Stirring up*, connected with that action, certainly passes into a variety of meanings, which are apparently very different from such an action. R. Ainsworth explains MOL*ior* by "To move, or *Stir*.—To toil, MOIL, or take pains and "labour about.—To heap up, throw, cast, manage, order, pro-"perly, some great thing.—To build, or raise, properly a great struc-"ture.—To rig.—To prepare, or make ready.—To enterprise, or under-"take; to attempt, or endeavour, to do a thing; to design, meditate, "project, plot, or continue." The Lexicographers refer MOL*ior* to MOL*es*, "The MOLE, a pier, or Dam;" where we are directly brought to the Heap or Mound of MOULD. The terms PIER and DAM belong to their respective Elements PR, DM, for the same reason, as I have shewn MOUND and MONS to belong to the Element MN. Among other senses of *Moles* we have *Grandeur*, Cumber, and I shall shew, that GRAND*eur*, GRAND*is*, GRAND belongs to GROUND. The Lexicographers refer MOLES to MOLA, A MILL, MEAL, &c. where we see, that the MILL is that, which reduces substances to MOULD, and MEAL is that, which is reduced to a substance of MOULD nature. MOLO means To *Grind*, MOLOR, To be *Ground*, says R. Ainsworth, where it is impossible not to see, that GRIND belongs to GROUND.

The Latin MOL*ior* will teach us another operation of the Human mind, and will shew us, that the idea of *Stability*, and that too of the most intensive kind, as connected with the greatest and most ponderous objects, may be derived from the idea of *Agitation—Moving* or *Stirring* about, &c. "To Build, or raise up a great Structure." The same

same union of ideas takes place in *Structure* and STRUO, 'To pile or 'raise high,' &c. which latter word is acknowledged to belong to STOREO, STROO, STRONN-UMI, (Στορεω, Στρωω, Στρωννυμι,) STERNO, "To Throw, "or Strike down," to which some have justly referred the English STROW, and they might have added the English STIR likewise. Thus we perceive how the *con*STRUCTION of the sentence, now before the Reader, "*Struere* orationem," may belong to the action of *Throwing* up—about, &c. We shall at once see from the senses of STRUO, which relates both to the *Heap* and the *Structure*, how our terms STORE and STORY, Contignatio, "The first STORY," may belong to each other and to STRUO, &c. According to my view of the question all these words must be referred to the TERRA, which perhaps we shall see more fully in the English THROW. Again let us mark, that STRUO has the metaphorical sense of Mental operation, which is annexed to *Molior*, as 'To *Contrive*,' which R. Ainsworth has used in the explanation of both these words. We know, that *con*TRIVE belongs to TERO, TRIVI, "To rub, to break, to bray, bruise, or stamp," another form of the Greek TEIRO, (Τειρω, Vexo, adfligo, infesto, molesto, domo, subigo, &c.) which brings us to the English TEAR, TIRE, &c. No one, I think, will doubt, that TERO belongs to TERRA—'Ad TERRAM 'vel pulverem redigere.' Let us mark the terms MOIL, MOLESTO, MOLESTUS, belonging for the same reason to MOLIOR.—In the Phrase *Terere* tempus, we see how something which can be applied to Dirt, or to *Reducing things* to *Dust* or *Powder*, may belong to *Time;* and we see in the word *Time*, which is acknowledged to be attached to *Tempus, Temperies Tempero*, "To *Temper*, mix, or mingle, &c."—*Temperat Arva*; —To *Temper Mortar*, &c. that the same object may belong to the same spot, under another mode of conceiving the materials, found upon its surface.

The Latin COLO will show us to what various purposes, an operation relating to the *Earth*, may be employed. R. Ainsworth explains COLO, "To *Till*, or husband, *Ground*.—To deck, trim, or adorn.—To Dress, "or Prune.—To inhabit, live, or dwell in.—To worship, to revere.—"To Love, favour and esteem.—To make court to, to be attached to, "or to wait upon one.—To make love to a woman.—To exercise, "practise, or study.—To follow and use.—To maintain, preserve, and

"keep

"keep."—Here we see, that the various ideas of *Respect* and *Reverence* in its highest state, of *Mental application*—of *Ornament—Dress*, &c., belong to *Tilling the Ground*. We must not wonder, that ideas, bearing so opposite a sense to the original action, which may appear to some of so homely a nature, should suffer no stain from the baseness of their origin. This impression speedily vanishes, and the idea comes into the mind free from any foul adhesions of its original matter, though still impregnated with its original force. We adopt the same word in the most opposite senses of *Dignity* and *Vileness*; nor is the more dignified sense at all debased by the more foul application, in which it may be sometimes used. The word *Reverence* is, we know, a term of the greatest dignity, nor is its force weakened or sullied by an ignoble use, to which it is sometimes applied. We shall all, I think, agree, that the Latin Colo belongs to Sol*um*, just as Till may appear to belong more immediately to the form Tell*us*. The explanatory term *Dress* belongs, I imagine, to *Dirt;* but whether it does or not, it equally illustrates my hypothesis. It is applied to the *Cultivation* of Land—*Cookery*, and to *Ornament* or *Cloathing*. In the phrase "Dum *Moliuntur*, dum Comuntur annus est," we again see, how elaborate *Ornament* may belong to *Ploughing* the Ground.

Thus we know, that *Ornament—Finery—Spruceness—Cleanness*, &c. may be derived from *Dirt*; and this union of ideas is effected in various ways. I have shewn, that Cl*ean*, Cl*ear*, &c. is attached to Cl*ay*, from the idea of Cl*earing* or Cl*eaning* a surface from *Dirt* or Cl*ay*, just as we talk of *Mudding* a Pond; and we find in the same manner, that Purgo, Pur*us* belong to *Pus*, Pur*is*, Foul Matter. I have shewn, that Mund*us*, "Clean, neat, fine," &c. is derived from the idea of removing *Dirt*—ab *e*Mund*ando*, *e*Mung*endo*, where in Mungo we unequivocally see the idea of Filth. In the Greek Miaino, Minthos, (Μιαινω, Inquino, conspureo, Μινθος, Stercus, Merda,) we see the form MN for *Dirt*, though in the term *Miaino*, quasi Miaj*no*, we see the forms MJ and MN. The preceding terms to Minthos, (Μινθος,) in my Greek Vocabulary are Mind*ax*, Mintha, (Μινδαξ, Suffimentum quoddam, Μινθα, Mintha, Herba suavis odoris,) where, I think, we shall agree, that these terms for the *Incense*, and the

strong

strong or *sweet-smelling* Herb MINT were taken from the scent of the *Dung*. I must here observe, that the terms for sweet odors are commonly derived from the idea of *Strong* smells, which belong to the strong smell of *Foul matter*. It is allowed, that *per*FUME belongs to FUM*us*, which is no very pleasing exhalation; and it is impossible, I think, not to acknowledge, that FUM*us*, "Smoke, Reek, or FUME," has some relation at least to its companion FIM*us*. The Latin POL*io*, another elevated term to express what is *Polished—Polite*, exhibits on the first view the idea of Scratching or Rubbing on a surface, so as to remove something, which we might venture to call Dirt; and its attendant POLL*uo* but too plainly points out the base origin, from which it is derived. Thus we see, how *Polish* and *Pollution* are allied to each other. We shall own too, I think, that LIMA, a File; and LIMO, "To File, to take away what is superfluous, to *Polish*," belongs to LIM*us*, for the same reason. The FILE is that, which removes what is FOUL.—In POLL*en*, Fine flour, or the *Dust* that flieth in the "Mill: also in the small *Dust* of any thing," we see another purpose, to which the idea of *Dust* or Dirt may be applied. While I examine these words POL*io* and POLL*en*, in my Latin Vocabulary, I cast my eyes on POL*us*, "The *Pole*, the end or point of the "axle-tree, whereon Astronomers imagine Heaven to be turned.—"Heaven," which is acknowledged by all to be derived from POL*eo*, (Πολεω, Verto, Verso, Aro); and thus we see, how the POLES of the Heavens,—and the *Heaven* itself may be derived from the lowly action of PLOUGH*ing* up the Ground. I shall shew in the same manner, that the term HEAV*en* is taken from the raised UP HEAP, as it might be of *Dirt—Mud*, &c.

There is another mode of conceiving the substance of Dirt, from which the idea of *Ornament—Finery*, &c. may be derived; and this mode of obtaining the idea of what is *Fine—Gaudy*, &c. consists in supposing a surface to be *smeared over with Dirt*. This we shall imagine to be an extraordinary mode indeed of arriving at the sense of *Finery*, or a *shewy appearance*, as it is called; yet nothing is more certain or more common. In our English term *Dawb*, 'A mere 'Dawbing,' we begin to perceive, how this idea may be obtained, but

but in the term *Varnish*, where we have the idea of a *Smearing* substance, and in the Latin *Fucus* we perceive the process accomplished. In our own Language, DAWB is applied, as *Fucus* is, to a showy—imposing appearance, though it reverts to its original sense by being applied to a *vile* purpose,

"So smooth he DAWB'D his vice with shew of virtue."

Even that Greek word, which conveys the idea of something, as it were, inexpressibly and superlatively, *Charming—Fine—Splendid—Gay—Gawdy*, &c. &c., even that word, which our young Grecifying bards are so delighted to see glittering in their Sapphics—or their Iambics—or their Hexameters, even GAN*os* itself, (Γανος, Lætitia, voluptas; splendor, item quod est in quâque re pulchrum, nitidum, hilare, venustum,) must be referred, I fear, to the *Vile Dawb* or *Varnish*. In the verb GAN*oo*, (Γανοω,) when it is interpreted by "*Lævigo* polio," we begin to perceive something of its base, *superficial* quality; but the following passage from Casaubon on Athenæus will unfold to us the whole secret. The Author of a Glossary quoted by this great Critic observes; "*Stagno*, Περιπεταλω, ΓΑΝΩ, λιμναζω. Γανω, *Stagno*, "Γανωτης. *Stagnator*;" on which Casaubon observes, "Nescivit "distinguere inter *Stagno* et *Stanno*; siquidem ita scripsit. Deinde "aliud est περιπεταλωσις, figulinæ, ut puto, vocabulum, aliud "Γανωσις. Vasa ærea, sicut et fictilia, *Stanno* illinebant, ut argentea "viderentur. Κασσιτερω αλειφειν, hoc dixerunt et Γανουν." Whether STANN*um* and GAN*os*, (Γανος,) should be considered as directly belonging to each other, it is not necessary to enquire; but we shall now perceive, that they both belong to the same Elementary character C, D, &c.}N, and both signify to *Smear—Dawb* a surface over, in order to make it look *Fine*. We shall now likewise see, that the substance TIN—STANN*um* is nothing but that, which STAINS or TING*es* a surface. It will be moreover perceived, that the Glossarist is not wrong in his term STAGN*o*, which at once belongs to the STAGN*um*, the Lake, the Spot, where the *Smear* Matter is, and to the substance STANN*um*, the *Smear* matter itself. We see, that LIMN*azo*,

(Αιμναζω,) to *Smear*, belongs to LIMNE, (Αιμνη,) the Lake, for the same reason.

That I am right in my origin of TIN—STANNUM, as denoting the STAIN or TINGE smear'd or spread over a surface, will be unequivocal from considering the parallel Celtic terms *Stean— Stan—Ystaen*, &c. Mr. Owen explains *y*STAEN, (TAEN,) by "That is spread out, that is "Sprinkled over, a STAIN, also TIN;" and Mr. Thomas Richards produces as a Welsh word, corresponding in sense, with the English TINCT the term *y*STAEN*iad*. In English even the word STAIN is applied to the most gawdy exhibition of *Colouring* in the expression STAIN*ed* Glass. We shall now understand, that all these terms for the gawdy TINCT bring us directly to the English TINS*el*. I cannot quit the Greek GANOO, (Γανοω,) without reminding the Reader of another parallel term, which actually signifies 'To make White—by spreading *Dirt* 'over it; i. e. to White-wash,' as we express it. This term is KONIAO, (Κονιαω, Calce induco, calce dealbo, Cerusso, Fuco,) &c., which is only another form of GANOO, (Γανοω.) The Latin COLOR, "A natu- "ral COLOUR, a *Die* or blue.—The outward shew or beauty of a "thing;" COLORO, "To COLOUR or die," still belongs to the idea of SOIL—'To SOIL,' &c.; and thus we see, how these words are attached to COLO, and SOLUM. Let us mark the term *Die*, *Deag*, (Sax.) Color, where we perceive the sense of a DUSK*y*, DUST*y* Spot, from which it is taken. In Greek, CHROA, CHROS, and CHROZO, (Χροα, Color, Χρως, Color, Χρωζω, Coloro, Colore, Tingo,) relate to *Colour*, *Colouring*; and that these terms are derived from the idea of the *Die* or *Daub*, will be manifest, when we remember their kindred words CHRAO, CHRAINO, (Χραω, Commodo, Oraculum edo, Imbuo, Tingo, *Polluo*, Χραινω, Coloro, *Contamino*,) which actually signify To *Foul*. We shall now see, that CHRAO, of which CHRIO, To Smear, is only another form, belongs to CHORA, the Ground, (Χραω, Χριω, Oblino, Χωρα, Terra, Ager.)

If the terms signifying, what is *Clean—Ornamented—Fine*, &c. can be derived from the *Dirt* of the *Earth*, we shall not wonder, that the terms, denoting what is *Foul,—Vile, Rotten, Decayed*, &c. either in *Matter*

Matter or *Morals*, should be derived from the same lowly and *Dirty* Spot. Hence we have FOUL—FOOL, VILIS VILE, &c. belonging to the idea of FIL*th*:—MAL*us* belonging to MOULD;—KAK*os*, (Κακος,) to such words as KAK*ao*, (Κακαω, *Caco*,) &c. VIT*ium*, VICE, BASE, BAD, &c. FŒD*us*, "Filthy, Nasty, Dirty—Mean, sorry, rude "—Base, shameful, Vile, Destructive," &c. &c. to such words as FÆX, FÆC*is*, PUDGE, &c. &c. and thus through the whole compass of Language. The idea of *Good* qualities—of that, which is *Commendable—Excellent—Virtuous, Moral*, &c. is taken from a great variety of sources, which it would require much time to detail. One source is that of *Soft* materials, as we have seen in MOLL*is*, "Calm, gentle, "temperate, mild, exorable," where MILD belongs to MOLLIS,—TEMPER*o*, refers to the TEMPER*ing* of *Soft* Matter; and CALM, as I shall shew, belongs to SLIME. TEMPER*ate*, TEMPER*atus*, expresses a *Good quality*, under one mode of conceiving *Dirt, Mud*, &c. so under another mode of conceiving it, as the *Foul* substance in agitation, &c. we have the *Bad* quality, as exhibited by "TEMER*o*, To violate, to "*Defile*, to unhallow, or profane," TEMER*arius*, "Fool-hardy, rash," &c.—TEMER*e*, "Confusedly, in a huddle;" to which we must add the word TEM*no*, To despise. Another source for *Good Qualities* is to be found in the idea of what is *Clean—Clear*,—from which the Dirt is removed, as we have before seen; and hence we have CLA*rus*, the Greek KAL*os*, (Καλος, Pulcher, Probus,) &c. PUR*us*, PURE, &c. belonging to *Pus*, PUR*is* Filth, and in PUD*or*, PUD*icus*, PUD*et* we see the idea of the highest Purity connected with the notion of what is *Vile*, or PUS, PUDGE, &c. as if we should say, 'There is PUDGE, PUS, to me;—There 'is a consciousness to me of what is of a PUDGE nature—of what is '*Vile* or *Foul*, &c. as of a thing to be avoided.' SHAME belongs to the Element SM, TM for the same reason. The idea of *Good Qualities* is often derived from actions of *Excitement—Violence*, and hence we have PULC*her*, at once relating to *Valour* and to *Beauty*, though still retaining, in the latter sense, its original idea;—*Pulcher*, "Stout, "Valiant, Fair, beautiful, well-favoured.—Fine, gay, splendid, excellent, good." We cannot but see, how PULC*her* connects itself with the terms of *Violence* PELLO, VELLICO; and hence it is, that BELL*us* and BELL*um* bear a similar form. For the same reason it is, that *Violence—*

Courage

Courage — Finery — Goodness are united in our words BRAVE, BRAVERY, BRAVADO, &c. — But the sources for terms representing *Good* and *Bad* qualities are so numerous, that they cannot be exhibited in a brief detail.

The action of *Stirring* up—*Agitating*—*Breaking* up or to pieces—*Routing* up, &c.—*Scratching* up—*Tearing* up—*Vellicating*—*Scraping* up or upon—*Grating* upon, of reducing to *Dust* or *Powder*, &c. &c., under various modes, accidents and purposes, with various degrees of *Commotion*—*Agitation*—*Noise*, &c., by *Ploughing* up, over—*Harrowing* up—*Raking* up, over—*Digging* up, *Treading* upon, &c. the surface of the EARTH, has supplied Language with the Terms, which express those *Accidents*—*Operations*, &c. of *Routing*—*Scraping*, &c. and the other *Accidents* and *Operations* of a similar kind, as likewise with a Race of words, which belong to a metaphorical application of such actions. Under this Race of words are included Terms, which express *Excitement*—*Agitation*—*Commotion*—*Noise* — *Disturbance* — *Annoyance*, actions of *Force* and *Violence*, as applied either to Matter or to Mind, in various modes and with various degree of intensity and effect.—The imperfection of Language does not permit me to express at the same time the cause and the effect — the active and the passive state; but the Reader will understand, that these actions of *Power* and *Violence* include in them likewise the ideas of *Weakness* and *Imbecillity*, by passing from the *Agent* to the *Patient*, concerned in the same action; as To *Break*, To be *Broken*, To *Rout*—To be *Routed*,—To *Harrow*, To be *Harrowed*; and hence we have a Race of words, denoting a *Broken* — *Disturbed*—*Weakened* — *Harassed*—*Distressed state*, from the slighest suffering of *Irritation*—*Vexation* and *Annoyance*, to the most extreme condition of *Desolation* and *Destruction*. In considering the origin of these words, we cannot separate moreover the appearance of the matter on the surface of the Earth from the state of that Matter, when excited or acted upon by the various Accidents, &c. attached to it.—Among these appearances we have the *Earth* in a *Rough*—*Cloddy* state—in a *Dry*—*Gritty*—*Stony* state—in confused disorderly heaps of Dirt, in a *Mish-Mash*, *Muddy* State, if I may so say, *Mixed* and jumbled together; all which appearances co-operate in forming

forming different turns of meaning in the order of words, which I am now describing. The Reader will best understand the various senses, annexed to such Terms, by a brief collection of the Terms themselves under different Elements, and I shall sometimes introduce those words, which convey the more original idea. Among these Terms we must class *Break, Bruise, Burst, Harrow, Harass, Rout, Rake, Rough, Rugged, — Stir, Tear, Tire, Waste, Vex—Plough, Plague, Pluck, Impell, Vellicate.—Quash, Gush, Gash, Cut, Scatter Mash, Mix,—Smash, Scrape, Grub, Grave, Gripe, Grieve, Grief— Quell, Kill, Slay, Slush, Slash, Clash, Embroil, Embarrass, Ground, Grind, Grunt, Mill, Pell-Mell, Moil, Molest, Throw, Thrust, Strike, Spread, Spurt, Sprite, Spirit, Scratch, Scrietch, Grate, Teaze, Tease, Toss, Drive, Drub, Perturb, Trouble, Scar, Scour, Sore, Sorrow,* &c.

The illustration of this Race of words would lead us through the whole range of Language; yet we cannot but see, on the most superficial view of the question, that actions of *Violence* and *Agitation*, both of Matter and of mind, have been perpetually annexed to the action of *Stirring up* the Ground. The poets have always found their strongest metaphors of *Annoyance* and *Disturbance*, drawn from the process of *Ploughing* and *Harrowing*. The strongest term in our own Language for mental *Solicitude* belongs to HARROW—'It HARROWS up the 'Soul,'—'It HARROWS me with *fear* and *wonder*,' and the Saxon Term, to which HARROW belongs, as HERGIAN, means "To HARROW, Vastare, "spoliare, prædas agere." ROUT at once means 'To Stir up the 'Ground,' and is applied likewise to the most violent action of *Disturbance* and *Annoyance*. The Psalmist, as we know, has applied the metaphor of *Ploughing* in its most expanded form, to Affliction and Desolation; "Many a time have they *Afflicted* me, from my youth, "but they have not prevailed against me. The *Plowers Ploughed* "upon my back: they made long their *furrows*." I shall shew that the word *Affliction* belongs to the *Plough*; and the very term, which I have applied to express mental disturbance,—*Solicitude*, is acknowledged by some to have been derived from 'Stirring up the Ground;' *Solum* and *Cito*; I say, by some, because even this has not been universally understood. R. Ainsworth has explained it thus, and the various

senses,

senses, which it bears, will serve to shew, what ideas may be derived from that source. "*Solicito*, To *Stir*, or *Dig* up, properly the *Ground*. "To Disquiet, to busy, to trouble, to disturb, to make *Solicitous*.— "To *Solicit*, to provoke, or to be in earnest with, one; to importune, "to press, to be urgent, to intice one to do a thing.—To sue, or pray, "for.—To allure."

I beseech the Reader to cast his eyes over the various senses of AGO, AGITO, SUBIGO—EXERCEO, and VERTO, VERSOR, which do actually relate to operations on the *Ground*; and from hence he will learn, what a vast variety of ideas may be attached to that action. It is not necessary to prove here, what I shall prove on another occasion, that such was the original application of these words, from which the other senses are derived; as it is sufficient for our present purpose to shew, that these various ideas are really connected with this action, and therefore, that such an action may be a source, from which these various ideas can be derived. R. Ainsworth has detailed the modes, in which these words are applied, after the following manner. AGO, "Properly to drive gently, or forcibly.—To do or execute any "business.—In both which senses it is translated to the mind, as upon "due attention may appear, in the manifold use of this verb.—To talk "of.—To mind, or observe.—To require.—To take care of.—To endea- "vour.—To sue, implead, or indite.—To apply, or bring to.—To "move, or shake.—To disturb, or disquiet.—Absol. To live.—To act, "or personate.—To act, or shew, the part of.—To treat or deal with. "To plead.—To exercise.—To count or reckon.—To manage, or "govern.—To bargain, or contract, for. It is often Englished by the "verb of the following noun." In the phrase AGERE *Terram aratro*, and in *Vervactum*, quasi *Vere*-ACTUM, "Verno tempore *Aratum*," we see its application to the Ground; and the term *Actor* means, we know, "An Actor, Agent, or doer.—A bailiff, or comptroller.—An Actor in "a play.—A Pleader at the bar," where in the *Bailiff* of the *Farm* we are brought to the same spot.

I shall shew, that the *Pleader* and the *Player*, with their kindred terms, denoting *Action*, the *Plier*, and the *Plodder*, belong ultimately to the *Plougher*. If *Pleader* has a Teutonic origin, as some imagine,

imagine, and was not derived from *Placitum* and *Placeo*, which were adopted probably from a misapprehension of the original idea; it belongs to these words, for the same reason that *Actor* denotes the same character; but if it be derived from *Placitum* and *Placeo* we are still not removed from the sphere of the *Plough*. I shall shew, that *Placo*, "To make calm, mild, or gentle," is derived from the idea of *Violence*, in reducing things or persons to such a state; and that this sense is connected with the action of the *Plough*, &c. and that *Placidus* and *Placeo*, denote the passive state of quietness, into which persons are reduced by that act of Violence. Thus we see, that in Language as in Life, our *Plagues* and *Pleasures* are indissolubly entangled with each other; and that in order to be *Pleased* we must first patiently submit to the wholesome discipline of *Compulsion*. It should seem, as if the "Perturbed Spirit" of man could not rest without the operation of some strong cause of this nature contributing to his quiet; and it is certain, that the History of the World affords us a perpetual illustration of this composing process.—The sense, which I have annexed to *Place*, will at once connect this word with the terms of Violence similar in form, *Plaga* and *Plecto*, and it may be added, that in the sense, which *Plecto* bears of *Plait*, we again see the idea of the Ground *Ploughed* or Turned up—about—over, &c., just as *Volvo, Involvo*, belong to the idea of *Routing* up—about, or in the Dirt.

R. Ainsworth explains AGITO by "To Drive.—To *Agitate*, to "shake, or wag.—To chase, course, or hunt.—To manage, or go-"vern.—To trouble, vex, and disquiet.—To consider, and cast about. "To handle, and debate.—To exercise and practise.—To dwell." The sense of *Agitation* is brought to the Ground in such applications as the following: "Sic cultibus et *Agitationibus Agrorum* fatigationem "accedere." In SUBIGO we have this idea fully unfolded, which means, according to the same authentic interpreter, "*Subigo*, To "bring under, to subdue, to conquer.—To force, or constrain.—To "shove, or thrust.—To Break, *Ear* or *Till*.—To beat, or stamp.—"Nequam voc.—To *Dig*, or cast up.—To rub, or stroke.—To whet." The terms EXERCEO and *Exercitus* are thus explained; "To *Exercise*, "to

" to *Ply*. To use, to practise, to profess.—To instruct or train up.—" To *Till*.—To occupy." Exercet frequens *Tellurem* " To pass, or " lead.—To vex and trouble.—To keep from idleness, to find one work. " —To employ, or lay out to advantage. *Exercised*, employed, inured " in any thing. Also tormented, troubled, teazed, vexed, turmoiled, " wearied. Also tried and approved." In the same Lexicographer are the following interpretations. Verto, " To turn.—To transform. " To change.—To dye, or discolour.—To overthrow, to cast down, " to turn upside down.—To dig or cast up." Quo sidere *Terram* Vertere Conveniat. " To borrow of one to pay another.—To im-" pute.—To translate.—To be changed, or altered.—To happen, fall " out, or prove. Verso, To turn often.—To tumble up and down, " or over and over.—To stir, or turn, about." "Versare *Terram*, " Plough it."—To " To drive from place to place, as shepherds do, &c.—" To manage.—To weigh, to consider.—To perplex, tease, or fret.—" Versor, To be turned.—To be employed or exercised in a thing.—" To *Converse*, to stay with one.—To be. Versus, Turned, changed.—" *Overturned*, ruined, abolished. Propense, inclined. Versus, A " Turning again at a land's end. A *Verse*." I shall shew, that *v*-Erto and *ex*-Erc*eo* belong to the Element ^RT, and mean 'To 'Earth up,' &c.

I have produced these examples from the detailed explanation of an humble Philologist, that the Reader may at once learn what nobody has known, from that which every body does know, at least is supposed to know.—Our interpreter has faithfully detailed the senses of these words; and in this explanation, well studied and well understood, will be found the most abundant materials of knowledge, for developing the vast variety of ideas, which, as we now see, actually are connected with, and which therefore may be derived from that impressive and important action of *Stirring up the Ground*. All this, I say, every one is supposed to know; and yet the Reader, I trust, will grant, that of all this nothing was known, when he considers the various senses, attached to these words, under the impression of the train of ideas, which I am now unfolding. It was from the careful and constant perusal of words like these, which were acknowledged

to

to belong to this action in one of their senses, that I was conducted through the Labyrinth of Languages, and was enabled to see the relations of ideas to each other, which on the first view appeared the most opposite and remote. I examined diligently all the explanatory terms, adopted by the interpreters of such words; and I enquired whether some of those terms likewise might not be attached to the same train of ideas, when compared with other terms under the same Element, to which they belonged. I saw by this process, that PLY and *em*PLOY belong to PLOUGH—that *s*TIR and TURN must be referred to the same action on the TERRA; and so of various other words adopted in the above explanation.

We see from the consideration of these words SOLICITO, VERSO, AGITO, that *mental* operations, which have been allowed to be derived from Material objects, are attached to the Agitation of the Earth. We have seen, that *Revolve*, 'To *Revolve* things in the mind,' has been connected with *Wallowing* in the Mire; and we know, that *Rout*, To *Rout* into a Matter, *Scrutor*, To *Scrutinize*, *Scruta* Eruere—*Rimor*, (Terram Rastris Rimari,) are directly associated with the action of *Routing* into *Dirt*. Poets at all times have derived their allusions to mental operations in *Thought*—*Solicitude*, &c. from the idea of *Agitation*; and they seem to labour under their theme, as if they were unable to devise expressions, sufficiently impregnated with the idea of *Agitation*, to represent that incessant and rapid motion, which the *Thoughts* experience in moments of solicitude and meditation. To such images as the Πολλα φρεσιν Ορμαινοντα of Homer, the Commentators fail not to produce the well-known passage of Virgil, which may serve as an host of familiar quotations, relating to that topic. The very term VERSO has been adopted in this passage of Virgil, as best accommodated to the Agitation of mind:

> "Atque animum nunc huc *celerem*, nunc *dividit* illuc;
> "In partesque *rapit* varias, perque omnia VERSAT."

I shall present before the mind of the Reader, in a brief and cursory detail, a few more examples, some of which are acknowledged to be derived from the objects on the Earth, although in their mode of application they appear to be most remote from that spot. We

have seen, that terms for *Cookery* have been derived from Dirt, as in *Dress*, 'To Dress the Land,' and 'To Dress Meat,'—the delicious Cake, belonging to the Cake of Dirt, and the very term Cook to Coquo, which is applied to the Ground, "Coquere *glebas*." In Greek, the most exquisite term for *Condiment* is derived from Sprinkling with *Dung*; and in our own Language our good Huswives are accustomed to Powder, or, as it might have been, to *Dust* or *Dirt* over their pickled meat. The tub, in which the operation is performed, is called the *Powdering* Tub, which in our ancient Language has been applied to a very different purpose. The Greek term, to which I have alluded, is Ονθηλευω, "Proprie Fimo agrum aspergo, deinde cibos ex- "quisite condio, quia ut fimo agri fæcundiores, sic cibi condimentis "delicatiores fiunt." I shall shew in the course of my enquiries, that Con*dio*,—Candy, &c.—Sugar—Candy, belong to Cœn*um*, Mud. In *Candy* we see the idea of a lump, as in Cake; and we shall now acknowledge, that it is not derived from the Island of *Candia*, as some imagine.

Our names for *Dignities* are derived too from the humblest objects. We have already seen the origin of *King*; and most of the other names for rank and authority are derived from a source equally lowly. I dare not venture far into this discussion, as it would lead us through a wide range of Human Speech. Yet we shall at once recollect, that Duke, Dowag*er*, and Duch*ess* belong to Dux and Duco, which bring us to the *Drawer* or Digg*er* of a Ditch, Duc*ere Fossam*. The term Doct*or*, the Teacher, is the Duct*or*, the Leader, or Guide, which brings us to the same spot. The Marq*uis* and the Count are the personages, who belong to the March*es* of a *Country*, and to the Count*ry*, or District itself. It is agreed, that the term Clergy belongs to Kleros, (Κληρος, Portio agri colono data,) the allotment of Land. The dignity of Chancellor is acknowledged to be derived from the *Cancelli* "Lattices or windows, made with cross "bars of wood, iron, &c. Fenestræ Clathratæ," as R. Ainsworth explains it; and whatever may be the origin of the *Cancelli*, the explanatory, parallel Latin word *Clathratæ*, (fenestræ,) will shew us, from what an humble source such a term might have been derived. The term

term *Clathratus*, "Latticed, barred, cross barred, grated," is acknowledged to be derived from *Clathrus*, "A bar, or lattice, a grate with "cross bars.—Also a *Harrow* or *Rake* to break Clods with." We shall now see, that *Grate*, the bar, belongs to *Grate*, the verb, denoting the action on the Ground, which brings us likewise to the idea of a *Gritty*, Rough surface.—I shall shew, that CANCELLI belongs to our term SHINGLES — SHINGLY Ground, in Scotch CHINGLE, "Gravel, as the word is pronounced in some places, elsewhere "CHANNEL," says Dr. Jamieson. We must remember too, that SHINGLE means, "A *Lath*, or cleft of wood to cover houses with," as N. Bailey explains it, where we are brought still nearer to the *Lattice*.

The idea, which we annex to *Delirium*, appears very distant indeed from any thing belonging to the Earth, and yet it is acknowledged, that this word means "To turn aside from the *Furrow*, q. "extra *Liram* rationis evagari." *Deliro*, (Ex *De* and *Lira*,) "Pro-"perly to make a balk in earing of Land.—To doat, or rave; to talk "or act idly."—The terms BENCH and the BANK of *Earth* are acknowledged to belong to each other; and let us mark, to what venerable and worldly purposes, the BENCH or BANK, as denoting the Seat, have been applied;—'The BENCH of Bishops'—'King's BENCH'—'The BENCHERS of Lincoln's Inn,' and to the most complicated artifice in mercantile life, 'The BANK of England, BANKERS,' &c. And thus our monied men have their real or imaginary property in BANKS—which belongs to the BANK of Earth—or in the FUNDS, which belongs to the FUND*us*, "Land or Ground,—the Bottom," or in the STOCKS, which brings us to the Stump or Stem of a Tree. Even those, who unincumbered with such 'low thoughted cares,' pursue in dignified solitude and in silence, whether in garrets or in parsonages, the study of good *Letters*; even they are fixed to the same spot, and bound by the same spell. Their good *Letters* are in their origin nothing but the *Dawbings of Dirt*, (*Literæ*, quasi *Lituræ*,) and they commonly continue and terminate amidst the same materials. The Learned personage, who writes in Latin, is employed in *Ploughing*, *Exarando*, (*Exaro*, To *Plough* or Dig up—To write, or indite,) and I shall shew, that

that *Scribo*, and *Grapho*, (Γραφω,) belong to *Scrape*, *Grave*, *Grub* up, for the same reason. I shall likewise shew, that the English WRITE means to WROOTE, ROOT up the EARTH.—The man of *Profound* knowledge still belongs to the *Fundus*, "Land or Ground, the bottom."—The man of *Erudition* to *Rudus*, or Rubbish,—of *Investigation*, to the *Vestigium*, the Print of the Foot-Step on the Ground, &c. &c. If he *Revolves* the most abstruse subjects in his mind, he is only *Wallowing* in the Dirt, (*Voluto*, 'To Roll, To *Wallow*, to toss, To think of, '*Revolve*, and toss in one's mind,')—if he *Scrutinizes* a subject with the most piercing eye, he is merely Routing into *Scruta*, "Old trash or "trumpery."—Even the *Grounds* of his argument, on which he prides himself so much, are not formed of nobler materials, than the *Grounds* of his tea or his beer, or even than the *Ground*, on which he treads:—If he be a man of brilliant *Conversation*, or if he be *Conversant*, or *Versed* in various Arts and Sciences, he is still associated with the Plougher or Digger of the Field, (*Versor*, Terram, *Versor*,)—if he be a man of *Cultivated* mind, or if he duly *Exercises* his faculties, he is still engaged in the same employment: If he should write the most charming *Verses*, he is advanced no further than the turning of the furrow, (*Versus*, A turning again at a Land's end,) and if even those Verses should contain the most *Sublime* conceptions, "thoughts that breathe, and words that burn;" even then, he is but just emerging above the *Mire*, (*Sublimis*, qui Supra *Limum*.)—Nay the writer, and the Reader, who produces and peruses these truths on the humble origin of Languages in the *Preliminary Dissertation* now before them, have their attention fixed on an object, which is derived from the Sower of the Field, and the Mud before their doors: (*Dissertatio*, *Dissero*, à *Sero*, and *Præliminary* from *Præ*, and *Limen*, a *Limus*.) This derivation of *Limen* from *Limus*; as denoting the part exposed to the effect of Dirt, will surely not be doubted, though it is not acknowledged by the Etymologists, who among other conjectures derive indeed *Limen* from *Limus*, though not as signifying Mud, but as denoting "Obliquus, transversus, &c.

I shall close these remarks by producing the various senses annexed to the derivatives of VERTO, VERSO, which as we have seen, express the action

action of *Stirring up* or Ploughing, &c. the *Earth*; and we shall be amazed, I trust, at the nature of the human mind, by which it is enabled to produce such an abundance of ideas, attached to materials, so unpromising, as it might appear, and so unfavourable to such a process. In the following sentences we shall perceive a few only of the various applications, in which this family of words has been adopted, 'The 'Perversion of the mind.'—'The *Vertex* of a Triangle'—'The *Subver-* 'sion of an empire,'—'Johnson *Versus* Williams,'—'In the *Inverse* 'Proportion,'—'The *Reversion* of an Estate,'—'The *Conversion* of the 'Gentiles,'—'The celebration of an *Anniversary*,'—'The *Converse* of a 'proposition,'—'Witty *Conversation*,'—'A man *Conversant* or *Versed* 'in all sorts of Learning,'—'The *Advertisements* of a News Paper,'—'A devouring *Vortex*,'—'The *Diversions* of the gay,'—'The miseries 'of *Adversity*,'—'A Man of a *Versatile* genius,'—'Severe *Animad-* 'versions on a person's conduct,'—'Notes and *Animadversions* on 'Horace,'—'He *Averted* the danger,'—'Mortal *Aversion*,'—'Sublime 'Verses,'—The new *Version* of the Psalms,'—'A *Vertigo* in the head,'—'*Tergiversation*,'—'The System of the *Universe*,'—'The *University* of 'Cambridge, *Universally* celebrated for its arts and institutions,' &c. If I had suggested to the Reader, without recalling to his mind this detail, that the various ideas, which are conveyed by the above words, might be and even were connected with the action of *Stirring up the Ground*, I should have been considered, I fear, as an idle Theorist, determined on the support of my hypothesis, however wild and visionary it might be. Even now the apprehension of such a sentence on my labours still continues to weigh upon my mind, and I have yet much, I fear, to perform, before we can persuade ourselves to descend from the lofty heights of our own imagination, which are lost amidst the clouds, to that lowly spot, on which we trample indeed with our feet, but on which likewise we are destined to be born, to live, to act, to speak, to think, to suffer, and to die.

I shall not pursue to a greater length this vein of illustration, which it is the business of the whole Work to unfold, as the examples, which I have already given, will be sufficient, I trust, for the purposes of a Preliminary Discussion, in which it is intended only to awaken

awaken the attention of my Reader to the contemplation of the subject, and to prepare his mind for the admission of that new train of ideas, which is involved with the principles of my hypothesis. Whatever sentence may be passed on the final success of the Writer in establishing his System; the preceding facts will certainly prove, that remoteness of application, in the sense of words, from an original idea cannot be urged against the probability of my hypothesis. It is impossible to conceive purposes and applications more various and remote from each other than those, which we have seen exhibited in the examples, above produced; and yet it is acknowledged, that they are all actually connected with the action of *Turning up the* EARTH, whether the original idea be or be not annexed to that action. Let us for a moment suppose, what is most probable, that such is the original idea, and we may take occasion from hence to offer an observation, which will be perpetually applicable in the progress of these enquiries. We perceive, that in these various applications of VERTO, and its derivatives, the original idea has totally disappeared, and that these words in their ordinary use are wholly remote from the action of *Turning up the Earth*, just as if they had never been derived from that action, or never applied to it. Now if this original sense of VERTO had been obscure or lost; and if we had possessed no artifices; by which we could recall the word to its original spot or action; all our diligence might have been exerted in vain, when we endeavoured to discover the Fundamental idea. The Reader must be prepared to expect the same difficulty and embarrassment, when I am employed in examining a Race of Words in the prosecution of these Enquiries. He is not to imagine, that I shall be enabled at every moment to produce absolute proofs of my hypothesis, by shewing, that the word, which I examine, is or has been actually connected with the EARTH.—The Reader can expect only to find such evidence, as the subject will admit, and when he reflects for a moment on the nature of the question, and considers the infinite variety of purposes, most remote from the *Earth*, to which the terms of Language are applied; he will not wonder at any deficiency of absolute and direct proof in the support of such an argument; but he will rather be astonished

astonished to find, that a regular and continued series of discussion, imparting even an imperfect species of evidence on this question, can be instituted and pursued with any tolerable success. If the doctrine, that words were originally derived from the *Earth*, had been universally acknowledged; it would still be as universally agreed, that the idea of the *Earth* has totally disappeared in the ordinary appli-tion of those words, and that the original and fundamental idea was to be discovered only by the most diligent search, and to be exhibited only with full—absolute evidence on certain occasions. As we proceed forward however in these enquiries, and understand the nature of the evidence, which is attached to this subject, we shall be amazed, I trust, to discover, how the force of this evidence increases, and how the coincidence of similar facts on similar occasions, regularly and perpetually recurring, may at last afford a species of conviction, which was never to be expected on a subject like this; and which some perhaps will consider, in its effect at least, as invested with all the properties of proof. The Work must be studied in the spirit of candour, and the ardor of curiosity, as a Work dedicated to the investigation of a subject totally unknown, and destitute of all the means of assistance, which were most necessary for its production. As Languages have never been conceived under this point of view; so the expositors of those Languages have never supplied any helps, which were directed to that purpose. Every thing was to be discovered, which related to this view of the question; and it is not necessary to suggest the laborious and painful researches, which the Writer was destined to undergo in effecting these discoveries.

The adepts in those Languages, which I may be supposed least to understand, and on which little information is to be obtained, as the Dialects of the Celtic, &c., will no doubt perceive, that I have been sometimes mistaken in the leading idea, which I have attributed to a word; but they will never, I trust, find, that I have hastily delivered my opinion, without first endeavouring to study the genius of that word, with due care and diligence. In the explanation of terms, belonging to Languages, with which both the Author and the general Reader may be supposed to be better acquainted, I shall sometimes, I fear,

I fear, be found deficient on occasions, where that deficiency was least to be expected. It will be seen, I suspect, that I have omitted to cite many passages, most known and familiar, which would have been singularly illustrative of the truth of my hypothesis. In the *curiosa felicitas* of the Poet and the Orator, whose combinations are formed from the influence of strong and just impressions, we see the original idea annexed to words; and from hence we are enabled to draw the most apposite and striking examples of their primitive meaning. If I have omitted sometimes to avail myself of such examples, the omission is not always to be attributed to the negligence or the ignorance of the Writer. It must be remembered, that as these enquiries are directed to the consideration of words under a certain point of view, which was never before presented to the mind; innumerable passages may have escaped from our recollection, even in those writers, with which we have been most conversant from our earliest days, if such passages have not actually passed before us, since that period, when the very words, which they are calculated to illustrate, have become the objects of our enquiry. The deficiencies of this kind, whatever they may be, will hereafter be readily supplied without effort, and without search; and the intelligent observer will furnish to himself, in the course of his reading, every assistance, which can be derived from this source.

The System, which has been delivered in the present Dissertation on the nature of Languages, would open into a wide scene of important and profitable meditation. Many of these topics however would best be understood at the conclusion of our labours, if that period should ever arrive, when the various facts, relating to Human Speech, shall have been fully unfolded, and firmly established. We may bear however in our remembrance some of those topics, on which our attention should be peculiarly fixed; and as we proceed forward in our research we may apply our discoveries to the elucidation of that mysterious process, by which kindred Languages have been thus generated, propagated and preserved, over the face of the Earth. We might enquire, and we cannot but enquire, with the most anxious curiosity, whence it has arisen, 'that the same *Elementary Language* has been thus

thus universally diffused,' we might almost venture to assert, through every region of the Globe. We cannot even attempt to give any answer to this question, till a great body of facts shall have been collected respecting the nature of that Elementary Language, about which we so anxiously enquire. The Mosaic origin of the Human Race from the same common Parents might enable us to solve a portion of this difficulty; yet the diffusion of a Common Elementary Language is attended with other circumstances, which that fact alone will not be able to explain. We shall discover, that this diffusion of a Common Speech is involved likewise with the propagation of common opinions—of common practices, rites and ceremonies, civil and religious. It should seem too, that all this has been effected by a peculiar process; just as if one great nation had been once spread over a wide extent of the Globe—advanced in arts and sciences—united and communicating with each other by one common Language, by the same Religious observances, and the same Civil Institutions. Of a nation, thus great and powerful, existing in the most remote periods, no traces are to be found in those Histories of the Pagan World, which are considered as the authentic records of Mankind, and which some are disposed to reverence with peculiar and exclusive idolatry. From these teachers or their disciples nothing can be learnt, which will assist us in accounting for the various facts, exhibited by Language, in the most striking and impressive manner. We must look to higher authority for the solution of these difficulties; and the Mosaic History will alone supply us with the narrative of that extraordinary event, to which all our discoveries in Language at once lead us, with direct and irresistible conviction. We must ascend to those distant periods in the Revolutions of our Globe, when according to the first and greatest of Historians, "*The* WHOLE EARTH *was of* ONE "LANGUAGE, *and of* ONE SPEECH."

Every portion of the narrative, which is connected with this great fact, is pregnant with the most important truths; and must be studied with all the diligence of an enquiring and ardent spirit, if we are desirous of prying into the secret history of remote periods; which is indeed deeply buried, though not, as I conceive, wholly and irre-

coverably lost, under the ruins of the ancient World. The plain of SHINAR, propitious for the arts and inventions of its inhabitants,—the preparation of *Clay* for brick, and of slime for mortar—the building of a City and a Tower, are all allusions to important events, which are confirmed by dark though impressive traditions, universally diffused among the nations of the Earth. The name of SHINAR, whatever may be the spot to which it alludes, is deeply involved in the extraordinary event, by which it is accompanied, and perhaps some future enquirer will discover in this significant term the name of the great tribe or nation, who may lay claim perhaps to that universal Language, which was spread over the Earth.

I have supposed on a former occasion, (p. 29,) that the CELTS originally signified "the workers in CLAY, the artists, who made "bricks for building — vessels of Pottery," &c. &c.; and hence *Builders—Architects—Potters*, &c., or, in other words, that they signified "the Illustrious persons, who were the great *Artists* of the "Ancient World." I have supposed, that the TITANS have a similar meaning, and belong to such words as TITAN*os*, (Τιτανος, Calx, gypsus,) &c. &c. If, then, we should venture to conjecture, that the CYNTS, a division of the Celts, still belong for the same reason to CŒN*um*, &c. &c., as denoting the workers in the same materials, we shall see, how all these ideas co-operate to the same end. We ought to remember, that a great nation still exists under the name of the CYNS or CHIN*ese*, who still derive their glory from works belonging to the same matter of CŒN*um*, or *Clay*; and that they have afforded to the Western world a name for the most familiar and elegant of our utensils, which is derived from their own country. *Aneurin*, in his Gododin, has divided the *Celts* of the British Isles into "CYNT, "a *Guyddil*, a *Phrydin*." If we should still proceed in the same vein of observation, and imagine, that the PHRYD*ins*—the BRIT*ains*, &c., were possibly derived from the same source, the illustrious nation, who now bear the name and speak the Language of the PHRYD*ins*, would inform us, that in their Language, PRIDD or PRIZ denotes "Mould, Earth, &c.; PRIZ*aur*, A Potter; PRIDD-*faen*, a "Brick, or burnt tile; PRIDD*gist*, Potter's Earth," &c. &c. We cannot

not but see, how the *g*-YDDILS, or the IDDILS may bring us to the ATLS or the ATL-*antidæ*; and if this process should be just, we are advanced to a great point indeed. In the fate and fortunes of the ATLANTIDÆ the wonders of the Ancient World are deposited; and the Reader will certainly be astonished, when his mind is occupied with this train of reflexions, to learn, that in a Chinese tradition referring, as it is supposed, to the subversion of the Island of the ATLANTIDÆ, it is recorded, that "*Maurigasima* was an island famous "in former ages, for the excellency and fruitfulness of its soil, which "afforded, among the rest, a particular *Clay*, exceedingly proper for "the making of those vessels, which go now by the name of "*Porcelain* or CHINA ware." (*Davies' Mythology of the Druids*, p. 149.) This is assuredly an extraordinary tradition, as relating to the ATLANTIDÆ, which will appear still more extraordinary, when we remember, that among the personages called ATLANTIDÆ were ATLAS, one of the *Titans*, and his brother the great worker in *Clay*, &c. *Prometheus*. I have observed in a former page, (105,) that PERION, the father of *Amadis*, "is the chief personage in a transaction, belonging "to the greatest Physical event, which ever happened on the face of our "globe;" and that this event, according to the Chinese, is connected with the plastic materials of *Mud* or *Clay*. Now in the Chinese tradition, the personage, who was saved from this Deluge, was king PEIRUUN, who escapes to China in a ship, where his arrival is still celebrated by a yearly festival. Even Mr. Bryant has seen, who has indeed, (I must solemnly declare it,) seen nothing even of that, which he professes most to have seen, even Mr. Bryant, I say, has understood, that the Greek PHORON*eus*, who lived in the time of the flood, &c. &c. belongs to the character of *Noah;* but he has not seen, that the PHORON in PHORON*eus* is the PEIRUUN in the Chinese tradition. It must have been seen by many, as I suppose, that *i*NACH*us*, the son of *Oceanus* and Tethys, bears the very name of *Noah*, נח NCH, NOACH; but the Reader will be astonished, I conceive, when he finds, that PHORONEUS is the son of *Inachus*. The adepts in Druid lore will now understand, that PHORON*eus*, the instructor of mankind in various institutions, belongs to the PHARAON, the Higher Powers, whose priests

priests are the *Pheryllts*, "the first teachers of all curious arts and "sciences." (*Davies*, p. 215.) The term PHARAON seems to belong to the Welsh PERON, "That causes or bids to be, the Creator, "the Lord," the corresponding verb to which is PERI, "To cause, "to effect, to make, to do; to bid, to command;" as Mr. Owen explains them; and we shall now see, that PERI is nothing but the Latin PARO, "To make, shape, or contrive—To *pre*PARE," &c. &c. This glimpse into the dark regions of tradition will shew us, that a new system of Mythology must be conceived and executed, before the secrets of the Ancient World will be unfolded to our view.

The pursuit of this enquiry would lead us into a wide field of discussion, and as the purposes of the present Dissertation are, I trust, sufficiently fulfilled; it is necessary that these Preliminary observations should be now brought to their conclusion.—I must again appeal to the curiosity and the candor of my Reader; that he may proceed forward in these investigatious, with a mind willing to learn, and pliant to conviction. Every thing conspires in a work of this nature to place the writer in a perilous situation, which demands a patient hearing and a favourable reception.—To develope, in an intelligible and conciliating form, a new and remote train of ideas—to combat ancient prejudices, either obstinately maintained or duly defended,—to bring the mind back again in periods of learning from a sophisticated state, to plain principles and simple conceptions—to be entangled in the toils of Language, unable to explain her own processes; these are all great and important difficulties, which an enquirer into subjects like these, is at every step of his progress destined to encounter, and bound to overcome. Even the private and the personal causes, which may impede a writer in the prosecution of his Work, should not be wholly forgotten in our estimate of his performance; and though they cannot be produced in extenuation of ignorance and inability, they may at least be admitted as pleas of palliation for the lesser faults of omission and deficiency. A seclusion from spots, which are most favourable to researches of this nature, from Libraries, where Languages are recorded, and from capitals, where they are spoken, must have assuredly operated in diminishing the richness and variety

variety of a work, for which existing materials must be sought and cannot be created.—Much however is first to be performed, before the subject can be pursued in its fullest extent; and I have even purposely refrained from engaging in the whole range of the question, till the Languages, with which we are most conversant, shall have been duly and adequately unfolded.—To accomplish this object, even slender stores may be sufficient, if they are examined with diligence and applied with effect.

But even seclusion is attended with its blessings, if it be converted to a good and profitable purpose; and he, who labours with diligence and with zeal, will not often labour in vain. In the silence and solitude of incessant meditation much may be performed; and under the operation of patience—of industry, and of ardor, all difficulties will vanish, and all privations disappear. Even the dreams of the solitary, though they will often terminate in error and delusion, may yet inspire motives, which will enable him to proceed in his career—unwearied and unsubdued—amidst bright visions and exhilarating prospects. He may pass forward invigorated by the hopes, that all his toils and his labours will not finally be exhausted in vain, but that they will still continue to impart a ray of knowledge to beings, who are yet unborn, in ages, which are yet to come. Amidst these persuasions—all the difficulties, which surround him, will be unseen and unfelt:—He will listen to no other sounds but those, which re-echo his hopes, and seem to realize his visions.—If the solitary should indeed be lost in these delusions, he may appeal to the wisest of men, who was thus deceived by his good Demon into the path of knowledge, and the practice of virtue: "Ταυτα, ω φιλε εταιρε Κριτων, ευ ισθι οτι "εγω δοκω ακουειν, ωσπερ οι Κορυβαντιωντες των αυλων δοκουσιν "ακουειν, και εν εμοι αυτη η ηχη τουτων των λογων βομβει, και ποιει "μη δυνασθαι των αλλων ακουειν."—If the Author of these Researches could be admitted within the sphere of such delusions, his labours would indeed be rewarded, and all their purposes be fulfilled. If indeed he could be cheered by the hope, that he had succeeded in discovering the object of his pursuit,—that he was the fortunate being, who *first* disclosed to his fellow-creatures the great mystery of Human

Human Speech, – the mode, by which Man communicates with Man, he might indeed exult ;—He should then think, and he should then feel, that the fleeting period of his life had not passed away like a shadow, a mere void in the creation, without some record of his existence. He should then think, and he should then feel, that, from the recesses of his solitude, he had supplied to posterity some memorial of a mind, at once ardent in its search, and humble in its views, which looked not too high in its pursuit of Human Knowledge,— that object and acquisition of the creature *Man* ;—but which followed with patience—with perseverance and with zeal, the obscure vestiges of Truth, on those lowly spots, where Truth is sometimes contented to abide, remote from the lofty heights, at which Sages are wont to gaze, in vain and unavailing contemplation.

CONTENTS OF THE WORK,

AND

THE MODE, IN WHICH IT MAY BE STUDIED.

THE reasons, why the Work has assumed its present form will be explained in the course of its progress. Though all diligence has been applied to render the mode of its arrangement as commodious and impressive as the nature of the subject, and the circumstances connected with its prosecution, would admit; yet it may well be imagined, that another arrangement could have been adopted, in which the same truths might have been likewise communicated. In this Work *all* the Radical words are examined, in various Languages, in which the letter *R* appears, either alone, or as the first Consonant, with the Class C, D, &c. or the Labials M, B, &c., or L, N following, as ^R, ^R{ C, D, &c. M, B, &c. L, N, and likewise those, which appear under the form ^C, ^D, &c. From page 1 to page 1126 are fully considered the Races of Words under the Elementary Characters ^R, R{ C, D, &c. R{ N, L, as likewise those under ^C, ^D, &c.—From page 1127 to 1194 the words under the forms ^R, ^R{ N, L are collected and briefly explained; and from page 1195 to 1254 the words under the forms ^R, R{ M, B, &c. are likewise collected and briefly explained. In the first Volume to page 520, the words belonging to ^R{ C, D, &c. and ^C, ^D, &c. are examined as referring to a state of rest, and as belonging to the EARTH considered in that state.—In the second Volume to page 902 are detailed the Words, under the same forms, as denoting *Agitation*, and as belonging to the EARTH in a state of *Agitation*.—The Reader must not form his judgment from the evidence alone, which is produced in the first Volume, but he must wait till he has examined the evidence in the second Volume, where the same words will be again discussed, and contrasted with the terms, denoting *Agitation*; from whence perhaps it will appear, that the original *Fundamental* idea of these Words is that of *Agitation*, though in their secondary sense this idea has disappeared. From page 1 to 39 the parts of the Preliminary Dissertation, relating to the Elementary Doctrine, which particularly belong to the consideration of the Class C, D, &c. are recapitulated. From page 4 to 270, where the words are considered, which relate to a state of rest, the Reader may pass, if he pleases, after a less minute view to page 521, where every thing must be considered with the greatest attention. If the Reader should be so inclined, the parts under ^R{ C, &c., and ^C, ^D, &c. may be studied separately. Thus ^R{ C, &c. will be found from page 42 to 95—from 137 to 163, as referring to

a state

a state of rest.—From 521 to 651, as referring to Agitation.—From 876 to 902, Terms for Noise under both forms ^R{C, &c., and ^C, ^D, &c. are considered.—From page 903 to 1126 the Elementary form R{C, D, &c. N, L is considered. This may be studied as a separate discussion, affording the fullest evidence of the truth of the Doctrine.—The Elementary Character ^C, ^D, &c. is considered from page 96 to 136—from 164 to 270, as referring to a state of rest.—From 652 to 875, as referring to a state of *Agitation*.—From 271 to 520 the Elementary Character ^C, ^D, &c. is considered, when it is applied to express *Pronouns*, *Verbs of Being*, as IT, IS, &c. &c. This part may be regarded as entirely a separate Dissertation on the Composition of *Verbs*, *Pronouns*, &c.—the nature of *Particles*, &c., which the Writer has laboured with infinite care and diligence:—Here the original idea, whatever it may be, is in general lost, and the secondary one only prevails. If the Reader wishes at the same time to understand all the evidence respecting the original idea, he must proceed to page 825, &c., where the terms of *Stability* are compared with those relating to *Agitation*. I shall conclude by observing, that the whole Work should be read regularly through, according to the actual arrangement of the Writer; though it may be afterwards studied with advantage in separate parts, according to the mode, which is here detailed —The imperfection of Language, and the necessity for brevity may lead to an ambiguity, which it is necessary to explain.—When I say, that Languages are derived from the EARTH, I mean, that Languages are derived from that spot, which we commonly call the EARTH: and here I think nothing of the peculiar Elementary Character, under which words appear. When I say, that words under the Element ^R, R{C, D, &c. belong to the EARTH; I here suppose likewise, that such words belong to the spot, called the EARTH, though I mean moreover, that the very term EARTH is itself a *word* included in the same Race. In one case, EARTH denotes only the object, but in the other, while it expresses the object, it must be considered likewise as a *word*, bearing a certain form, distinguished from other forms.

^R. R. ^.---C, D, G, J, K, Q, S, T, X, Z.

THIS ELEMENT* CONSTITUTES, IN VARIOUS LANGUAGES,

A RACE OF WORDS,

WHICH RELATE,

EITHER DIRECTLY OR MORE REMOTELY,

TO THE

E A R T H;

AND

THE OPERATIONS, ACCIDENTS, AND PROPERTIES,

BELONGING TO IT.

---

* By the symbolical representation ^R. R. ^---C, D, G, &c., as the *Element*, or *Elementary* Characters, constituting a certain Race of words, belonging to each other and distinguished from other races, I mean to express those words, which appear *commonly* under the three following forms. 1st, Such words, of which R is the first Consonant, and the next is one of the Consonants C, D. G, &c., with a vowel breathing before the R, as ARCA, &c. This form of words I represent by ^R.---C, D, G, &c., or, as it might be written, ^RC, ^RD, ^RG, &c., where the mark

mark of the Caret ^ is used to express, that a vowel breathing is wanting, or is to be supplied before the R. 2dly, Those words, which like the former have R for their first Consonant and for the next one of the Consonants C, D, G, &c. but which have no vowel breathing before the R, as RACE, ROAD, &c. This form I express by R.---C, D, G, &c., or, as it might be written, RC, RD, RG, &c. 3dly, Those words, where the *r* does not appear at the beginning, but which have for their first Consonant one of the Consonants C, D, G, &c., with the vowel breathing directly preceding C, D, G, &c., as OCCA, &c. This form I express by ^.---C, D, G, &c., or, as it might be written, ^C, ^D, ^G, &c. In the first form, ^RC ^RD ^RG, &c., a vowel breathing may or may not exist between the R and the C, D, G, &c.; but in the second form, RC, RD, RG, &c., it must exist in order to constitute a word. In all the forms a vowel breathing may or may not exist after the C, D, G, &c. The Consonants C, D, G, &c. are sometimes found single, and sometimes combined with each other. Words under other forms are included within the pale of my Hypothesis, when those words are supposed to have directly arisen from the forms here exhibited, as *h*-EARTH, *y*-ARD, *w*-ARD, *g*-UARD, where the *h*, *y*, *w*, and *g* are considered only as different degrees of aspiration annexed to the vowel breathing. The other forms, which, in the process of change, I conceive to be derived from the same source, will be duly unfolded in the progress of these discussions. I have adopted the terms *Element* and *Elementary*, as applied to these Consonants, because I consider the Consonants to be the *Principal*, *Fundamental*, *Essential* or *Elementary* parts of Language, by which Races of words are formed and preserved, separate and distinguished from each other.

CHAP. I.

SECT. I.

^R.---C, D, G, J, K, &c.

Names for the Ground, Land, Soil, *&c. corresponding with the English word* EARTH, *as* ERDE, *&c.*——*Terms derived from the idea of the peculiar or appropriate place---the* Enclosed *or* Secured *Spot of* Land *or* EARTH---The EARTH, *by way of distinction, as y-*ARD, *&c.: hence, words denoting* Enclosures *of* Security, Safety, *and of* Defence, *as g-*ARD*en, &c.*; *or* Security, Safety, *and* Defence, *as gu-*ARD, *w-*ARD.---Enclosures *in general, of any kind, and for any purpose, as* ERKOS, (Ερκος, *Septum,*) ARCA, *&c.---Words signifying that which* Enfolds, Keeps in *or* off; Stops, Represses, Compresses, Constrains, *&c.*, as EIRGO, (Ειργω, *Includo,*) ARC*eo, &c.*: *Words denoting what is* Held *or* Confined *within a certain Spot, Enclosure, &c.*, as *h-*ERD, *&c.*

Names

Names corresponding with EARTH. (Eng.)

AIRTHA. (Goth.)
EARD, EORD, EORTH, EORTHE, YRTH, *g*-EARD. (Sax.)
ERDE, ERDA, ERTHA, *h*-ERDA, *h*-ERTHA. (Al.)
j-ORD, *j*-ORDEN. (Dan.)
ERD, AERDE, EERDE, &c. (Belg.)
ARZ. (Heb.)
ARK, ARG, &c. (Chaldee, Samaritan, Syriac.)

EARDIAN, EARDIGAN. (Sax.) Habitare; *i. e.* To be on a certain EARTH or Land.

ORDON. (Al.) Habitabat.

h-EARTH, *h*-EORTH, *h*-ERD, *h*-EERT, &c. (Eng. Sax. Germ. Belg.) Focus; *i. e.* The *Ground*, or EARTH.

THE term EARTH appears in the various Dialects of the Teutonic, and in some of the Eastern Languages, as the familiar name for the *Ground*, *Land*, *Soil*, &c. &c.; or, in other words, the Element, ^R. R. ^.---C, D, G, J, K, Q, S, T, X, Z, supplies, in these Languages, a familiar term, corresponding in sense and Elementary characters with our word EARTH. These various terms for the EARTH are acknowledged by the Etymologists to belong to each other. In Junius, the parallel terms for the EARTH are "Goth. AIRTHA. A. S. EORTHE. Al. ERDA. HERDA. "ERTHA. HERTHA. Dan. JORD. B. AERDE, EERDE." And in Skinner they are thus represented: "EARD, EORD, EORTH, "GEARD,—Dan. JORD, JORDEN, Belg. ERD, AERD, AERDE, "Teut. ERD, ERDE."

In Hebrew, ארץ ARZ is the appropriate and familiar name for the EARTH; as will be understood by learning, that it is adopted

adopted in the opening of the Book of Genesis. "In the "beginning God created the Heaven and the EARTH," ארץ ARZ. In Chaldee ארק ARK and ארע ARG are used for the EARTH. I have represented the letter ע *Gnain*, as it is called, by G, because it is commonly supposed to possess this power. In some cases, however, the sound of G in this Hebrew letter becomes weak, as it does in the English *Might*. In the Samaritan and Syriac the name of the EARTH may be represented by ARZ and ARG. In Arabic ارض ARZ is likewise the familiar and appropriate name of the EARTH. These Hebrew and Arabic terms are acknowledged to belong to the English word EARTH and its parallels. Mr. Richardson, in his Arabic Dictionary, gives us, among the terms for EARTH, ارض ERZ, اروض AROOZ, which he likewise represents by URUZ, اراض ARAUZ, ارضون ARZ*oon*, ارضين ARZ*een*. The preceding article to URUZ, "EARTHS, Grounds," in Mr. Richardson's Dictionary, is اروض ERUZ, "Firm, steady, rooted, fixed.—Collecting or contracting "one's self.—Avaricious, covetous, tenacious, اروز الارز "ERUZU'l'Erz, Extremely tenacious." We shall not doubt that ERUZ, Firm, steady, &c., belongs to URUZ, the EARTH, ("Thou "*Firm*-set EARTH!") From the idea of what holds *Firmly*, derived as we see from the "*Firm*-set EARTH," the Arabic word passes into the sense of *Avaricious;* and thus we can understand, at the very commencement of our enquiries, how the name of the EARTH may supply ideas, which on the first view appear very remote from the original source. Again, let us note the term ارز ERZ, adopted in the phrase "*Eruzu'l'*ERZ." The Arabic ارز ERZ or URZ means, says Mr. Richardson, "the "Pine, Cedar;" and in other senses we have "EREZ, A tree "whose timber is very hard. ARIS.—Firmly rooted (tree)." We here see, that the name of the *Cedar* is taken from the idea of what is *Firm*, whether as applied to its property of being

a *Firm*

a *Firm* hard wood, or of being *Firmly* Rooted. We shall not doubt, I think, that ERZ, *Firm*, Steady, belongs to ERUZ, *Firmly* Rooted, &c., and that they both belong to URUZ, the EARTH. Thus we see, how senses, apparently the most remote from each other, as *Avaricious*, and a *Cedar*, may belong to the same idea, as *Firm*, *Firmly* Holding, &c., and how that idea may have arisen from the name of the EARTH. In Hebrew ארז ARZ is the Cedar, and ARZ*a* is the name of this tree in Syriac.—These examples will shew us, what difficulties the Enquirer has to encounter, if the intermediate idea, by which remote senses are connected, should not be visible, and that patient investigation can alone enable us to discover those secret links, by which words are connected with each other. The Reader will likewise from hence learn, that remoteness of signification in words affords no impediment to the Hypothesis, which supposes that races or families of words may by some secret bond of union be ultimately related to each other.

I have recorded the Hebrew ארץ ARZ according to its original and genuine representation in Hebrew, without the vowel points, which were afterwards added for the purpose of attempting to convey with more precision the sound of words, as they were enunciated by the inventors of those points. The Reader, I imagine, well knows, that various Eastern Languages, as Hebrew, Arabic, Chaldee, &c., are written without vowels; or, in other words, that the vowels, which exist in those Languages, are of little importance in discharging regularly and familiarly those offices, which the vowels in our own Language, and in others of a similar kind, commonly perform. In the present instance we have no symbol to represent a vowel breathing between R and Z, which has sometimes been heard in the pronunciation of this word, and which is recorded, when the vowel points are adopted. The Hebrew ארץ ARZ has been represented, among

among various other modes, by AREZ, or ARETZ. Mr. Parkhurst has represented the supplied vowel by the Greek ε, and the whole word by *Earεj*. The Reader will perfectly understand, that the Hebrews and Arabs, &c. have acquired no art, unknown to Europeans, by which they can *speak* a Language without vowels: He will instantly perceive, that this rejection of vowels refers only to the *writing* of a Language, and he will learn from this practice of the Eastern nations, that the symbols employed to denote the vowel breathings are not absolutely necessary in recording words, or in conveying the sounds annexed to those words. Every one knows, that in reading our own Language we pronounce a word at once from the idea, which the whole symbol excites in our minds of the object intended, without stopping to consider the force of those various parts of the symbol, which attempt to represent the sound of the word. If then Consonants are of themselves able to excite in our minds the idea of a certain word, representing a certain object; they are able likewise to suggest at the same time the sound, by which that word is enunciated. This practice of the Eastern nations will prepare our minds for the admission of an important maxim, without which all our researches would be vain and futile, —that vowels may be considered as of no importance in recording Languages; but that the Consonants alone are the efficient parts of words, by which Human Speech is propagated and preserved.

The principles of the Theory, on which this work is founded, have been fully explained in the Introductory Dissertation, with which I suppose my Reader to be already acquainted; yet it may not be improper to state, on the present occasion, a general idea of the doctrine which has been there unfolded. The Reader will perceive, that though the name of the EARTH in the Dialects of the Teutonic has assumed various forms, as AIRTHA, EARD, EORD, YRTH, ERD, AERDE, *j*-ORD, &c. &c., yet that the

the letter R, together with the consonants T, D, still remain, and we know, that these Consonants have been ever acknowledged by Grammarians as *Cognate*, or such Consonants, which from their affinity familiarly pass into or are *Changed* into each other. If we proceed however to examine the examples before us, we shall perceive, that other Consonants pass into each other in conveying the same idea of the EARTH. We find, that in the Eastern Languages, the name for the EARTH has been represented under various forms, as ARZ, ARES, ARETZ, ARZ, ERZ, AROOZ, ARAUZ, URUZ, ARK, ARG, &c.; where we perceive, that Z, S, K, G are to be added to T, D, and that they are all to be considered as Commutable into each other, in representing the same idea of the EARTH. The letters *h*, *j*, *g*, preceding the vowels at the beginning of some of these words, as *h*-ERTHA, *j*-ORD, *g*-EARD, may be considered only as different degrees of aspiration annexed to these vowels. The *h* after the T in EART*h*, &c. represents only another sound of T, and the *en* in *j*-ORD·*en* is an appendage to *j*-ORD, which is the simple genuine form. Thus then, if we should be desirous of representing the familiar name for the EARTH, as it appears in various Languages, in an abstract point of view, we ought not to express it under this or that peculiar form, as EARTH, ERDE, &c., but we should say, that it might properly be represented by any of the Commutable Consonants, T, D, Z, S, K, G, with R before them, as ^RT, ^RD, &c. I have before stated, that by the mark ^ prefixed to the R, I mean to express, that a vowel breathing is wanting, or is to be supplied before the R. I have justly omitted the vowels employed in expressing these words, because, as we see, they have been *all* adopted without any marks of distinction of one vowel from another. I have thought it necessary to employ a mark for a vowel breathing before the R, in order to represent, that a vowel breathing has been used in

all

all the terms for the EARTH in that position; and I have omitted to employ that mark in other places, because in those places, as after the R and after the T, D, &c., it has sometimes appeared and sometimes not appeared. We know, that the letter J is only the softened sound of G, as pronounced in *George*—that Q is only a C*h*, or G with the sound of *u* after them, and that X is only a combination of KS, CS, &c. Thus we might venture to observe, that the familiar name of the EARTH, in the dialects of the Teutonic and some of the Eastern Languages, may be represented in an abstract general way by ^R.---C, D, G, J, K, Q, S, T, X, Z. We perceive, moreover, that this mode of representing EARTH, &c. would perfectly distinguish it from all other names for that object, as from the Greek *Chthon*, (χθων,) the Latin *Terra*, where the T precedes and the R follows, *Tellus*, &c. &c.

The Reader, whom the principles of Science have taught to understand the importance of symbols, and of converting particular into general representations, will readily admit, that the simple and obvious artifice, which I have here adopted, of expressing in general terms the name of the EARTH, may open into a new world of ideas, and may perhaps enrich the imperfect art of Etymology with a series of truths resembling the deductions of Science. When the artificial method of Algebraical notation, by applying symbols and using general for particular expressions of quantity, had been once adopted; it might have been safely predicted, that a new Science was invented, which would at last conduct the understanding to truths the most important and remote. In adopting this artificial mode of representing generally the name of the EARTH by ^RC, ^RD, ^RG, &c., I have in fact only applied the Eastern manner of expressing the same object, as ARZ, ARG, &c. The *A*, which is here used, only represents, what my symbol ^ does, the existence of a vowel breathing in that place; and is not considered as expressing the

sound of any particular vowel; since a vowel point is added to *A* in Hebrew, &c., in order to represent the sound of the particular vowel, which is there applied.

We may well imagine, that an object so important to man as that of the EARTH or Ground would supply a plenteous source of ideas, and form a great race of words expressing those ideas. This we should all readily imagine, on the first view of the question *à priori;* but the wide sphere of action, through which that object has extended its influence, will be understood only by an attentive consideration of the discussions in the present volume. We shall at once admit, that words, which express Operations performed on the Ground, as *Digging*—*Ploughing*—*Harrowing*, &c., or which denote some Accident or Property belonging to it, as that which is *Low*, *Inferior*—the *Base*—*Bottom*—*Foundation*—*Firmness*—*Stability*—*Solidity*, &c. &c. &c. would be all naturally derived from some words, signifying the EARTH or Ground. I shall shew, in the progress of these Enquiries, that all the explanatory terms, which I have here adopted, are directly taken from certain words, under different Elements, denoting the EARTH or Ground. The terms *Solidity* and *Foundation* are acknowledged to belong to *Solum* and *Fundus*, the Ground; and I shall shew in the present volume, that for the same reason the Greek ARC*he*, (Αρχη, Principium, Exordium, Initium, *Fundamentum*,) the *Foundation*, and the Latin O IGO, belong to our Element ^RC, &c. the EARTH, ARK, &c. &c. From ARC*he*, (Αρχη,) are acknowledged to be derived ARCH, as ARCH-*Bishop*, &c., ARCH*itecture*, &c. &c.; and thus we see how Languages have been formed. We may well imagine, likewise, what a variety of terms would be derived from the ideas, which I have above exhibited, by metaphorical allusion. The strongest term, which we have in our Language, to express the most violent state of mental *Solicitude*, is taken from an Operation performed

performed on the Ground, as 'To HARROW up the Soul.' I shall shew, that HARROW belongs to EARTH, HERTHA, &c., and that the second consonant of our Element ^RC, &c. has been lost. This is manifest by comparing it with the parallel terms in other Languages, which the Etymologists have produced, as HARSE, HERCE, HERSE, (Fr.) HARCKE, (Germ.) The form of the French HERSE will shew us, that the French word HARASSER, and the English HARASS, are derived from the metaphor of tearing up the EARTH with the HARROW or HERSE. This instance of HARROW will convince us, that, even when by the accidents of mutation the important part of our Elementary form has been lost, we are still not destitute of resources, by which we can ascertain the relation of a word to its true origin.— Let us mark the explanatory term above adopted, *Solicitude*, derived from *Solicito*, which is acknowledged to signify, in its first sense, "*To Stir*, or *Dig up*, properly the *Ground*," *Solum*, Citare. This instance would be alone sufficient to illustrate, how ideas most connected with mental sensations may be derived from the Ground.

Simple and obvious as the idea is, that the name of the EARTH would be attended by a numerous class of Derivatives; yet we do not find, that the Etymologists have profited by a notion so manifest, as it should seem, and indisputable. We shall scarcely find, in the progress of these discussions, a single instance, in which the Etymologists of our own Language have derived words from the term EARTH. If the Reader should imagine, that in my Hypothesis this idea is extended beyond its due bounds; he will at least, I trust, be of opinion, that it is a conception of considerable promise, and that an abundance of examples *must* necessarily exist, in which this cause has exerted its influence. It will be at once understood, that these Derivatives from the name of the EARTH will be discovered by the same record,

record, which was adopted in ascertaining the affinity between the EARTH and its parallel terms AIRTHA, &c.; namely, by the existence of the same set of Commutable Consonants, and of the same or similar ideas. The record of the origin, from which the Derivatives spring, will be as faithfully preserved in the forms of these Derivatives, as in the forms for the various names of the EARTH itself; though considerable difficulty will oftentimes arise in discovering the similar ideas, by which the original and derived object are connected with each other. The sense, which the Derivative bears, will oftentimes appear entirely remote from that of its origin; and all our sagacity will be required to discover the common notion, by which their affinity is recognised. I have before exhibited the same sentiment, as it cannot be too deeply impressed on the mind of the Reader. It will be allowed by all, that the name of the EARTH, AIRTHA, &c. &c. would supply various Derivatives in those Languages, in which it was the appropriate and familiar name for that object, as in the Dialects of the *Teutonic*, and the *Hebrew*, *Arabic*, *Chaldee*, *Syriac*, and *Samaritan*; but we shall find, that it has extended its influence to other Languages likewise, in which it does not appear as the appropriate and familiar name for the Ground, but in which a certain Affinity has been acknowledged to exist, as in *Latin*, *Greek*, the Dialects of the *Celtic*, &c. &c. The wide sphere of Human Speech, through which this Affinity extends, and the nature of that Affinity, will be understood only from an attentive consideration of the succeeding discussions.

The Consonant *r*, as it is enunciated by different organs, has sometimes the strong sound, annexed to that letter; and sometimes it serves only to lengthen out the sound of the vowel breathing, by which it is preceded. Thus we are unable to distinguish, without some effort of the voice, between *Father* and *Farther*. In general, the strong sound of *r* is lost in *Farther*, but

but sometimes we find it attached to *Father;* and thus we see, how it is lost by one mode of expressing a vowel breathing, and gained by another. Our ordinary pronunciation of the *r* may be considered only as the preceding vowel sound lengthened, or sometimes as producing little or no effect, and might be safely represented by vowels, as in *Border — Order — Recorder — Must-Ard — Former — Farmer — Corn — Eastern — Short,* &c. &c., which might be written *Bawder, Auder, Recawder, Must-ad, Faumer, Faamer, Cauen, Easten, Shawt,* &c.; and this mode of representation, which applies to innumerable other instances, would express with sufficient accuracy the force of *r* in the ordinary sound of these words. The strong sound of *r* is in my organs expressed by an effort of the voice, which I seem to perceive likewise in the enunciation of others. This effort is sometimes so marked, as to appear painful in the speaker, and to become disgusting to the hearer. Robert Ainsworth thus describes the strong and the softened sound of R. It is formed, he says, "in the upper part of the throat, but so vibrated by "a quaver of the tongue, and allision on the teeth, that it makes "a sound like the grinning of a dog, whence it is called the "canine letter: but the Romans, on the contrary, give it so "soft and lisping a sound, that in writing they sometimes "omitted it, calling the *Etrusci, Thusci,* or *Tusci;* and especially "before S; thus Ennius writ *Prosus, Rusus,* for *Prorsus, Rursus.*" From these observations we shall not wonder, that the Elementary form ^RC, ^RD, &c., or ^*r*C, ^*r*D, &c. passes into ^C, ^D, &c. Under the form ^C, ^D, ^G, &c. we have ESTIA, (Εστια,) AGO, Occo, (Lat.) HOUGH, &c. It is not to be understood, that every word under the form ^C, ^D, &c. has arisen from another word under the form ^RC, ^RD, &c.; but that these forms familiarly pass into each other, and belong to each other. It should be observed, however, that each form, though united together by

the

the closest affinity, may be considered as generating, by its own Elementary powers, if I may so express it, a Race of words peculiar to itself, and distinct in some measure from the other. The Reader will be enabled only from the examples to understand the force of this remark, and to comprehend the mode by which one Race of words passes into another; and yet each Race may be regarded under one point of view, as a distinct class, preserving at the same time the marks of difference and the record of similitude. It is thus in the natural world, that Races of animals, which are allied to each other, exhibit at once their appropriate characters of distinction and of affinity.

A vowel sometimes exists between the R and the C, D, &c. in the Elementary form ^RC, ^RD, &c., as in the Hebrew *Aretz*, &c.; and when in this case the vowel breathing before the R is lost, we have a Race of words generated, belonging to the form RC, RD, &c., as Rus, (Lat.) Rout, Root, Road, and the term, which I find it convenient so often to adopt, Race, &c. &c. &c. We see, that in the different senses of the word Race, as the Root or Stock from which a family springs, and the *Course* performed on a Road, we are brought to the Ground, as the common Spot, to which these two senses belong. In such terms, as Oruz*a*, (Ορυζα,) Oryz*a*, Rice, and Erut*hros*, Red, we see how the form ^RC, ^RD, &c. passes into the form RC, RD, &c. We shall readily understand, that the idea of *Colour* would be taken from the Ground, or Earth, as exhibiting Earths, or *Soils*, of various *Colours*. I shall shew in a future volume, when I consider the Element CL, SL, &c., that *Soil*, *(Solum,) Colo*, and *Color*, belong to each other. It may be observed of the form RC, likewise, what we have remarked concerning the form ^C, ^D, &c., that RC, when once existing, would generate a Race of words distinct in some degree from the class, from which it was derived. We perceive that the

the two forms of the Element RC, RD, &c., and ^C, ^D, &c., do not directly pass into each other, and are only related through the medium of the form ^RC, ^RD, &c.

My hypothesis is, that all these forms supply a Race or Races of words, which directly or more remotely belong to such terms as EARTH, AIRTHA, &c.; and that they relate to the EARTH, or to the Operations, Accidents, and Properties attached to it. By the expression *Directly or more remotely* I mean, that the words under those forms, either *directly* themselves denote the EARTH, with the Operations, &c. attached to it; or that, however various may be their senses, or however abhorrent those senses may appear from the ideas connected with that object, they are all ultimately to be referred, in degrees of distance more or less remote, to the EARTH and its Operations, &c., by that process of change, under which ideas and words pass into each other. I have stated, that by the *Race* of words under these forms, ^R. R. ^. --- C, D, &c., I mean those words, which have RC, RD, &c. with or without a vowel breathing before the R, for their first Consonants, and likewise those words, which have C, D, &c. for their first Consonant, with a vowel breathing before the C, D, &c. I have said that the Elementary Consonants are the *first* Consonants in a word, because I consider the word to be in its simple state, before the process of composition has taken place, and because they are commonly found in that state.

When I affirm, that words under the forms R. R. ^. --- C, D, &c. are thus related to each other; I must be supposed to mean, that the RC, RD, &c. and C, D, &c. in these words represent the true Elementary forms, that is, that they are themselves significant, and not derived from any other source or Element. Thus in *Astonish*, *Etonner*, (Fr.) *Erstaunen*, (Germ.) the *Ast*, *Et*, *Erst*, do not represent the Elementary form ^R. R. ^. --- C, D, &c.; nor are they of themselves significant, but

but they are compounds of *A, E, Er,* and ST, T, a portion of the Element $\overline{\text{ST}}$ N, SN, TN. I have placed the mark — over the ST, to shew that ST does not represent an Elementary form, of which S is the first Consonant, and T the second; but that ST is to be considered as a combination of sounds attached to the first Consonant sound in an Element, of which S, or T, &c. is the first Consonant, and N the second. In such terms as *Assist, Assisto,* which are compounds of *Ad* and *Sisto,* the *As* or *Ad* belongs indeed to our Element, and would therefore be once considered in its proper place; but the second S is to be regarded as a portion of the Element SS, ST; and therefore the *Ass* in these words does not belong to our Elementary form, nor are the words, to which it is attached, among the objects of our Hypothesis.

We have seen, that EARTH, AIRTHA, &c. have assumed the forms *h*-ERTH*a*, *j*-ORD, *j*-ORD*en*, *g*-EARD; where we may perceive, as I have before suggested, how the simple vowel breathing before the ^RT, ^RD, &c. passes through the aspirate breathing *h* to those stronger aspirations, which are represented by Consonants. I shall consider, in another volume of my Work, a great Race of words which appear under the Element G—RT, J—RT, &c.; and it will there be discussed, whether these forms ^RT and *g*—^RT, or G—RT, originally belonged to each other, by the process which is here exhibited. Whatever might be the process, from which the Element G—RT arose; we may observe, that when it was once formed, it may be considered as totally distinct from any other Element, and as generating a race of words peculiar to itself. I shall discuss only in this volume those words, under the forms *h*-^RT, *j*-^RD, *g*-^RD, &c., which directly connect themselves, as I conceive, with our Element ^RT, &c. We shall find, that almost all the words with the aspirate *h* before ^R.^.---C, D, &c. must be referred

referred to the Element ^RT, and the letters *w* and *v* will frequently supply another state of the vowel breathing before ^RC, ^RD, &c., ^C, ^D, &c.; as *v*-IRID-*is*, *v*-ESTA, (belonging to EST*ia*, Εστια, Terræ Dea,) which presents to us a race of words directly connected with those attached to our Element. We shall find, likewise, in the progress of these Enquiries, that the Element ^R. R.^.---C, D, &c. has furnished other forms, which will be duly examined in their proper places, and which can only be fully understood by tracing the process of changes in the examples exhibiting that process.

We have seen, that in many Eastern Languages, as the Hebrew, &c., Consonants only are used, and that the Vowels are rejected; that is, the vowels which exist in those Languages do not perform the same offices, which they do in modern Languages. It is not necessary to repeat, that this rejection of the vowels refers only to the writing and recording of a Language, and not to the speaking of it, in which, as we all know, Vowels are equally necessary as Consonants. We may divide the Consonants into three Classes: 1. B, F, P, V, M; 2. C, D, G, J, K, Q, S, T, X, Z; 3. L, N, R. The letters in the first class, B, F, P, V, M, have been called Labials, and familiarly pass into each other, to the exclusion of the rest. In the second class, which belongs to the Element now under discussion, C, D, G, &c. pass likewise familiarly into each other, to the exclusion of the rest: and the letters of the third class, L, N, R, may be considered as distinct from each other, and as having laws peculiar to themselves. It is not to be understood, that these classes are not sometimes connected; as we shall find that *all* the consonants, under certain circumstances, pass into each other. Still, however, the distinctions are preserved, and no confusion arises from this partial connection of the classes; as it is sufficient for the purposes of distinction, or of preserving and recording the distinctive

affinities of words, that certain Consonants *regularly* and *familiarly* pass into each other, to the exclusion of the rest. The partial connection of these classes with each other, like the exceptions to a Rule, serves rather to confirm and illustrate the general principle of distinction. The mode, in which these classes are connected, is conducted by laws of uniformity, which afford marks of distinction not less defined than those, which belong to the more general analogies. We perceive, in this arrangement, how the combination of these classes will afford various Elementary Characters, distinct from each other. The first class with itself and the others will exhibit the Elements B, &c.—B, &c., B, &c.—C, &c., B, &c.—L, B, &c.—N, B, &c.—R. From the second we have C, &c.—C, &c., C, &c.—B, &c., C, &c.—L, C, &c.—N, C, &c.—R. And from the third we have R—B, &c., and ^RC, &c., the Element which we are about to examine. Now all these Elementary characters express names for the *Ground*—*Soil*—*Earth*, and may be considered as distinct from each other. The other combinations, which are afforded under this arrangement, as L—B, &c., L—C, &c., and the minuter observations upon these forms, are discussed in their due places. What I have now exhibited is sufficient to shew, that the Consonants thus combined from these classes, if the classes are distinct from each other, as I have represented, afford full and ample records of distinctive affinity in classes of words; that is, of the affinity between words annexed to a certain class, as distinguished from words belonging to another class.

It will be granted, I think, that it is the business of the Etymologist to discover those words, which, by passing into each other, belong to, or are related to each other. If words pass into each other, they must carry with them the train of ideas which they convey; and thus the affinity of words to each other must be discovered, by shewing that they contain the same or similar ideas,

ideas, and that their forms have passed into each other, as distinguished from other forms. I shall now consider the changes of these forms, and shew the mode by which such affinity can be ascertained, as it relates to those changes only, and not to the ideas conveyed, which form a separate enquiry. It will be agreed, that it is in vain to talk or to enquire about the affinity of certain words to each other, if, in the process of change, all words pass into each other, without any recording marks of difference or distinction, by which one set or class of words can be separated from another. Hence it follows, that the component parts of words, or letters, by the changes of which into each other these various forms are produced, must be of such a nature as to supply these marks of distinction; that is, it is necessary that certain letters should so regularly and familiarly pass into or be changed into each other, to the exclusion of the rest, that the words, in which such letters are found thus familiarly passing into or commutable into each other, may be justly said to belong to each other, as distinguished from different sets and classes of words.

It is the duty therefore of the Etymologist to discover such letters, which, by thus regularly and familiarly passing into each other to the exclusion of the rest, will afford those marks or records of distinction by which the affinity of words is ascertained. If any letters should be found, which pass into each other, without supplying any such records of affinity, these should be rejected, as useless, and impeding to the purposes of the Etymologist, however important those letters may be in fulfilling other purposes. Such letters, which, by passing into each other create difference of forms, without supplying any distinctive records of the affinity of those forms, must impede and embarrass the art of the Etymologist, whose duty it is to discover the *Affinity* of forms, amidst all the disguises of difference

difference and variety. Now the Consonants supply these distinctive records of Affinity, and the Vowels do not; that is, certain Consonants pass into each other regularly and uniformly, to the exclusion of the rest, but the Vowels *all* pass perpetually into each other without any distinction; that is, they all pass into each other in such a manner, that there is no set or class of vowels, which are familiarly comutable into each other, as distinguished from or to the exclusion of the rest. I shall not stop to enquire, which vowels have the greatest affinity or similitude in sound to each other: I shall only observe, that this affinity, if any such there be, forms no barrier of distinction, by which these vowels are separated from the rest, but that they *all* perpetually pass into each other, without supplying any distinctive records of affinity to the words, in which they are used. The Consonants, therefore, should alone be regarded by the Etymologist in the exercise of his art, and the vowels be entirely rejected from his consideration. Thus the Elementary forms ^RC, ^RD, &c.—CR, DR, TR, &c., CL, SL, &c., are sufficient to mark the distinction between certain distinct and separate names for the Spot on which we live and tread, as EARTH, ERDE, &c., *Terra*, *Daiar*, (Welch,) and *Solum*, *Soil*; and they are sufficient likewise to mark the affinity of words belonging to these, and to shew, that each class is separate or distinguished from the other; as of HARD to EARTH, ERDE, &c.—of DUR*us*, to TERR*a*, DAIAR, &c., and of SOL*idus*, to SOL*um*, SOIL, &c. Here we see at once, how Consonants may preserve and record that distinctive Affinity, which I am endeavouring to impress upon the mind of my Reader.

That the Vowels perpetually pass into each other without distinction, and that the Consonants familiarly preserve these regular and distinctive changes, such as I have represented, will be seen from the general current of examples of words passing into

into each other. The Reader has only to cast his eyes for a few minutes over the Etymologicon of any Language, or to recollect words passing through various Languages, and he will see this truth fully illustrated. It is difficult to adopt a mode of producing examples of a fact which perpetually recurs; as the instances exhibited may appear to be selected for the purpose of supporting an hypothesis.

Let us take the numerals, in which are found the letters C, D, G, &c. &c., as *Two*, *Three*, *Six*, *Eight*, and *Ten*. The parallel terms to *Two*, as given by the Etymologists Skinner and Junius, are *Duo*, (Lat. and Gr. Δυο,) *Twai*, (Goth.) *Twa*, *Twe*, *Twy*, (Sax.) *Zuuo*, *Zwey*, *Zwo*, (Germ.) *Dau*, *Dwy*, (Welch,) *Dou*, (Arm.) *Do*, (Irish.) *Du*, (Dan.) In Persian, *Do* or *Du*, دو is *Two*. Here we see that the Commutable Consonants T, D, Z are changed into each other; and it is from the existence of these letters in the words *Two*, *Duo*, &c., that we ascertain the affinity of those words; while the vowels *uo*, *wai*, *wa*, *we*, *wy*, *uuo*, *wey*, *wo*, *au*, *ou*, *o*, *u*, afford us no assistance in deciding on this affinity. The parallel terms to *Three*, as given by the Etymologists, are *Drie*, *Dreo*, (Goth.) *Tri*, (Welch,) *Thrins*, (Goth.) *Tre*, (Swed.) *Dry*, (Belg.) *Drey*, (Germ.) *Dryer*, (Isl.) *Trois*, (Fr.) *Tre*, (Ital.) *Tres*, (Span.) *Tres*, (Lat.) *Treis*, (Gr. Τρεις,) &c. &c., where we see the change of *T* into *D*, and where we perceive, that the existence of the Consonants TR and DR, in all these words, shews their affinity; while the vowels *ee*, *ie*, *eo*, *i*, *e*, *y*, *ey*, *ye*, *oi*, *ei*, shew nothing of this affinity. *Six*, as it appears in various Languages, becomes *Syx*, (Sax.) *Ses*, (Belg.) *Sechs*, (Germ.) *Sei*, (Ital.) *Seys*, (Span.) *Six*, (Fr.) شش Sh-Sh, *Shash*, (Pers.), which Mr. Richardson represents by *Shush*, ست ST, *Sitt*, (Arabic,) as the same writer records the word. Here the Commutable Consonants X, S, C*h*S, T, at the end of these words, pass into each other, and SX, SS, &c. existing in these

these words, with the same idea, convince us that they belong to each other; while the vowels *i, y, e, ei, ey, a, u,* passing into each other without any laws of distinction, do not help us in discovering this affinity. In the Italian *Sei*, and the Greek *Ex*, (Ἑξ,) the final and the first Consonant of the Element is lost. This however creates no difficulty, as we are convinced that these words belong to the others, *Sex*, &c., because the Consonants S and X still remain, and because they convey the same idea. The various parallels for *Eight*, as they are represented by Junius, are *Octo*, (Lat.) *Okto*, (Οκτω, Gr.) *Wyth*, (Welch,) *Ahta*, (Goth.) *Eahta, Eht*, (Sax.) *Aht*, (Germ.) in modern German *Acht; Huict*, (Fr.) or, as it is now written, *Huit; Otto*, (Ital.) *Ocho*, (Span.) *Atta*, (Run.) *Att*, (Dan.) *Acht*, (Belgic.) In Persian, هشت HS*h*T, which my Grammarian represents by *Hasht*, and Mr. Richardson by *Husht*, means *Eight*. In these words we have the familiar changes of GT, CT, KT, C*h*, C*h*T, T, S*h*T, into each other; and the Cognate letters in those words, conveying the same idea, mark out to us, that the words are related to each other; while the vowels *ei, oo, wy, aa, eaa, e, a, ui, u*, passing promiscuously into each other, afford no marks or records of this relation. The parallel words, produced under *Ten* by the Etymologists, which belong to the form TN, &c., are *Tyn, Tin, Tien*, (Sax.) *Tien, Thien, Zehan, Zehen*, (Germ.) *Taihun*, (Goth.) We may add to these the Latin *Deni*, not produced by the Etymologists. Here we have the regular changes of the Cognate Consonants T, Z, D into each other, with the vowels *y, i, ie, ea, ee, aiu*, passing into each other promiscuously, without any laws of distinction; and we reason on this case as on the others. Thus, then, the numbers above exhibited might be expressed in Elementary characters by T^, D^, &c. TR, DR, &c. SX, SS, &c. ^C, ^T, &c. TN, ZN, &c.; and this mode of representing them will answer all the purposes of the Etymologist.

I shall

I shall now give an instance, in which the Labials and our Consonants C, D, &c. exist in the same words. The parallel terms to *Foot* and *Feet*, as recorded by Skinner and Junius, are *Fot*, *Fet*, (Sax.) *Fode*, *Foed*, (Dan.) *Fusz*, *Voet*, (Belg.) *Fuaz*, *Fuoz*, *Fuot*, (Germ.) *Pes*, (Lat.) in another case, *Ped*-is; *Pous*, (Gr. Πους,) in another case, *Pod*-os, (Ποδος,) where we see the regular changes of the Labials F, P, V into each other at the beginning of the word, and our Consonants T, D, S, Z changed into each other at the end of the word. The changes of the vowels are without any principle of uniformity; as *oo*, *ee*, *o*, *e*, *oe*, *u*, *ua*, *uo*, *ou*. If we represent, therefore, these terms denoting the part with which we tread, by FT, PD, &c., this representation will serve to distinguish them from other terms denoting that part, as *Troed*, (Welch) &c.; and will moreover serve to connect them with the PED-*on*, (πεδον, Solum,) to which they belong. Let us remove the Consonants, and say that the name, for the part by which we tread, is represented by *oo*, *ee*, *o*, *e*, *oe*, *u*, *ua*, *uo*, *ou*, we perceive, that these vowels by themselves mean nothing, and represent nothing; nor, when added to the consonants, do they afford us any marks of affinity and distinction, by which the words containing them, as *Foot*, *Pes*, &c., can be conjectured to be allied to each other, or to belong to PEDON, (πεδον,) or to be distinguished from *Troed*. Among the Celtic terms for *Pes* in Lhuyd are the Welch *Troed*, the Cornish *Truz*, *Treiz*, *Truyd*, the Armoric *Troat*, and the Irish *Troidh*, which belong, as we see, to each other, and to the English *Tread*, *Trudge*, and *Trot*. Here we see the changes of D, Z, T into each other at the end of the word, and the Consonants TRD, TRT, are sufficient to shew the affinity of these words to each other, as distinguished from other words, under a different Element; while the vowels *oe*, *u*, *ei*, *uy*, *oa*, *oi*, *ea*, *o*, afford no marks of affinity or distinction.

I must

I must again request the Reader to cast his eyes over any common book on the subject of Etymology, as Skinner, Junius, &c., in which the various parallel terms are recorded, passing through different Languages, that he may fully and completely understand how familiarly the Consonants C, D, G, J, K, Q, S, T, X, Z, pass into each other, to the exclusion of the rest. We are able however to illustrate the fact in a more general way, by appealing to the same test of the Commutability of Consonants, which has been adopted by the Grammarians themselves. Those Consonants are considered among the Grammarians of the Greek Language to be *Cognate*, or *Commutable* with each other, which are changed into each other in the inflexions of Nouns or *Verbs*. The instance of *Verbs* is well chosen, as the Conjugations of Greek verbs represent distinct and large classes of words; and therefore the changes of certain Consonants, exhibited in these Conjugations, represent the laws of mutation annexed to these Consonants, as connected with some general property and principle of the organs and the mind. It will be sufficient for our purpose to note the verbs *Frazo*, (Φραζω,) and *Orusso*, (Ορυσσω,) which are commonly produced in our Greek Rudiments, as examples to illustrate what is called the fourth conjugation of Barytone verbs; and the latter of these words will afford me a very striking instance of my Hypothesis, in another point of view. In FRAZ-*o*, FRAS-*o*, *e*-FRAD-*on*, *pe*-FRAK-*a*, (Φραζω, Φρασω, Εφραδον, Πεφρακα,) representing the same idea of Speaking, we find, that the Z, or DS, TS, and D, K, or C, C*h*, pass into each other. The verb ORUSS-*o*, or ORUTT-*o*, becomes in other tenses ORUG-*on*, ORUX-*o*, or ORUKS-*o*, ORUCS-*o*, ORUC*h*-*a*, or ORUC-*a*, ORUK-*a*, (Ορυσσω, Ορυττω, Ωρυγον, Ορυξω, Ωρυχα,) where the S, T, G, X, or KS, CS, and C*h*, C, or K, pass into each other in expressing the action of Digging. The sound of Q is similar to that of C, C*h*, or of the hardened G, with the vowel *u* after them; and

and J is like that of G, when it is pronounced in a softened manner, as in *George*; and thus all the mutations of C, D, G, J, K, Q, S, T, X, Z, into each other, may be said virtually to exist in the same Greek verb.

This affinity or relation of these Commutable Consonants to each other, will enable us to understand from what source has arisen that cluster of consonants, which certain writers have so violently and unwisely condemned in some Languages; as in the German, &c. It has arisen from an attempt at extreme accuracy in expressing the mingled sounds of these Cognate Consonants, which in some Languages have been inadequately represented by single characters. These mingled sounds exist in a greater or less degree in all forms of Speech, which chiefly differ in this respect, that in some Languages more precision is employed to represent that combination. One Language adopts the various characters, which are separately used to express the different sounds, of which this combination is formed; while another employs a single and appropriate symbol for that purpose, and a third contents itself with adopting a character sometimes used for one of those mixed sounds, of which the union consists. In our own Language, this combination of sounds is strongly impressed on a Foreign ear; and we accordingly find, that the representation of our words by Foreigners is loaded with Consonants, for the purpose of conveying to the ears of their countrymen the nature of those combined sounds, about which we so little reflect, and which we ourselves are satisfied with expressing by a single symbol. Thus in a German Dictionary, now before me, I find the sounds of our letters C, in C*h*, and J, generally represented by TSC*h*, and DSC*h*; as *Church* and *Judge*, by *Tschohrtsch*, and *Dschodsch*. The sound of the *G* in *Genius* is likewise represented by *Dschehnius*.

In Italian, C is sounded like *Tch*, as in *Cesare*, *Cecita*, which

is pronounced *Tchesare, Tchetchita,* in so delicate a manner, that you cannot distinguish, says Veneroni, whether a T or D is sounded. "Pour parler avec la delicatesse Italienne, il faut "faire sentir le T de *Tchesare, Tchetchita,* &c. si doucement, que "l'on ne connoisse pas si l'on prononce un T ou un D." Veneroni represents the sound of the Italian G and GG before the vowels *e, i,* by DG; as *Giro, Oggi, Dgiro, Odgi.* We may from hence see, how *Odgi* or *Oggi,* To-Day, belongs to *Hodie;* and how *Dgiro,* or *Tgiro, Giro,* what is round, a Circle, may belong to *Tour, Tour*-ner, *Tur*-n. We shall not wonder, that the sound of T or D is mingled with that of C*h,* when in English *T* is sounded like S*h,* as in *Nation,* quasi *Nashion,* or *Natshion.* The *C* in our Language has the sound of S as well as of K, as in *City, Cap,* quasi *Sity, Kap*; and thus we see how *S* is allied to K. In the Spanish Language, the *C* is sounded like T*h* before some vowels, and like the K before others; and when *h* follows the C, "it is pronounced," says Del Pueyo, "as in the English "*Much, Mucho.*" Let us mark, that in the pronunciation of our English word *Much,* quasi *Mutch,* or *Mutsh,* C*h* has the mingled sound of *Tch,* or *Tsh.* In German, *C* is represented by *Tsay,* and before some vowels it is sounded like TS. The letter *C,* which thus connects itself with *T,* T*h, D, S,* and with K, will shew us, how *T,* T*h, D,* and S pass into K, and its acknowledged Cognate G. The Greek Grammarians and all agree, that τ, δ, θ, T, D, T*h,* are Cognate with each other; and that κ, γ, χ, K, G, C*h,* are Cognate with each other: and we now see from this acknowledged affinity of C, C*h,* with T, D, T*h,* how the two orders, as they are here arranged, T, D, T*h,* K, G, C*h,* are related or Cognate to each other, by thus passing into each other. This mixture of sounds in the Consonants C, D, G, &c. is peculiarly observable in the Eastern Languages; and hence we find, that the travellers into the East, in their endeavours to represent these mingled sounds

sounds in various words belonging to those Languages, appear to have laboured under considerable difficulty and embarrassment. Dr. Vincent shews us the diversity of modes, under which different writers have expressed the name of a river in India. One portion of the compound for the name of this river has been represented under the following forms: "*Djen, Djan, Tschan,* "*Tschen, Chan, Chen, Chin, Jen, Gen, Tchun, Chun, Shan, San.*" (Voyage of Nearchus, page 82.) In the Russian Language, the sound of two letters has been represented by TS, TC*h*; and the enunciation of the third appears of so complicated a nature, that in an attempt to express this sound to a French ear, we have the representation *Chtch*; "en faisant très peu sentir le T," says the author of my Russian Grammar. The sound of the English Z, like the Greek ζ, is nothing but the combined sounds of DS, TS; and that of X, like the Greek ξ, of KS, GS, C*h*S, ("Duplices resolvuntur per σ et aliquam è mutis, ut ζ per δσ et "σδ Doricè, — ξ per κσ, γσ, χσ." Grammat. Græc.) *Q* is C, C*h*, &c. with a *u* after it; and we find, that words were anciently written under both these forms, as *Cuando* and *Quando*, and at present we write *Cum*, *Quum*, &c.

Let us now, then, represent the letters C, D, G, &c. according to the various modes in which we have seen them to be expressed or used; and we shall not wonder, that they pass readily and familiarly into each other; as, C, C*h*, (or TC*h*, DC*h*, TSC*h*, TS*h*, TS, T*h*, S, K,) D, G, (or DG, DSC*h*,) J, (or DSC*h*,) K, Q, (or C,) S, S*h*, T, (or S*h*,) X, (or KS, GS, C*h*S,) Z, (or DS, TS.) This mode of considering the subject will at once unfold to us the truth of my hypothesis, and will shew us how these Consonants, thus intimately related, become Commutable into each other, and how naturally their sounds are mixed with or pass into each other, either as blended by combination, or separated by division. Their union and their separation will alike illustrate the principle

by

by which they are related. Their union will shew us, how readily the organs of Speech are inclined to blend them with each other; and their separation will point out to us that propensity in the Human mind, by which it is prompted to express the same or similar ideas, appearing under certain varieties, by Consonants of a similar kind, distinguished by certain differences. It is not my province to mark the precise nature of such differences, nor to adjust the degrees of affinity, by which these Consonants are related to each other. Grammarians have attempted to perform all this, with abundance of diligence, by the division and subdivision of these Consonants into separate classes, which they have distinguished by a multitude of names, as *Cognates*, *Letters of the same Organ*, *Gutturals*, *Linguals*, *Palatines*, *Dentals*, *Semi-vowels*, or Doubles, *Mutes* of three kinds, *Aspiratæ*, *Tenues*, *Mediæ*, *Solar* letters, *Lunar* letters, &c. &c. I have abstained from such disquisitions; and have been contented to state, by an appeal to fact, the *Commutable* Consonants, or those Consonants, which familiarly pass into each other, in representing the same train of ideas. With this fact only is the Etymologist concerned, which remains the same, whatever may be the cause by which it is produced.

If any of my Readers, therefore, whose minds may be strongly possessed with the division of Consonants into different classes, should perchance object to the use of the term *Cognate*, as applied to all these Consonants, I have only to observe, that I have followed the ordinary Language of our Grammarians, in making the words *Cognate* and *Commutable* synonymous with each other, and that I have not adopted the term *Cognate* for the purpose of maintaining any Hypothesis about their degrees of *Affinity*, as a point at all connected with the truth of my Argument, or the mode of supporting it. I conceive, indeed, that these Consonants have been thus *Commutable*, because they are *Cognate*, or have

an

an *Affinity*, in various degrees and modes, with each other, and this we have fully seen in the preceding discussion; but the fact of their being *Commutable* into each other is that alone to which I appeal, nor shall I ever entangle myself in the idle attempt to adjust on every occasion the process of change, by which this Commutability is effected. We learn, at the earliest stages of acquiring the Rudiments of the Greek Language, as I have before stated, that K, G, C*h*, are *Cognate* with each other, and that T, D, T*h* are *Cognate* with each other. "Inter se cognatæ sunt $\begin{cases} \pi, \beta, \varphi. \\ \kappa, \gamma, \chi. \\ \tau, \delta, \theta. \end{cases}$"

A direct definition of *Cognate* is not given, but the sense annexed to it is manifest, from the explanation subjoined to the name of certain letters, which are called *Immutable*, Immutabiles, "Quæ "*non* literas Antistoichas vel *Cognatas*, *quibus ipsæ mutentur* in "verborum et nominum inflexionibus, habent." From hence it is plain, that the *Cognate* letters, or the *Antistoichæ*, are conceived to be those, which are *Commutable* into others. I have adopted therefore the ordinary phraseology which I found annexed to the subject; and I differ only from these Grammarians, by shewing, that according to their own idea of *Cognate* letters, as Commutable into each other in the Inflexions of verbs, the number of these letters should be increased. I have proved, that under this idea both these series of letters, $\kappa, \gamma, \chi, \tau, \delta, \theta$, K, G, C*h*, T, D, T*h*, should be considered as *Cognate* to each other; and, moreover, that ζ, ξ, Z, X, which these Grammarians represent to be Semi-vowels or Doubles, (Semivocales vel Duplices,) and S, which they regard as a letter of *its own power*, ("Σ est *suæ* "*potestatis* litera,") should be comprehended likewise under the same class with the former, by the name of *Cognate*, as being *all* Commutable into each other in the inflexions of verbs.

The

The Reader, I trust, will perfectly understand the precise point of view, in which I am desirous of representing the nature of these Cognate Consonants, C, D, G, &c., as they relate to the purposes of the Etymologist. I have no objection to the division made by Grammarians of these Consonants into different Classes, nor to their opinion, that the letters in each of these Classes more particularly belong to a certain organ, and are more intimately related to each other. I have no objection even to the Anatomical discussions, which we find in some Etymologists, who have exhibited the various parts in the organs of Speech, by which each letter is enunciated. These matters I shall leave to be investigated by others who are concerned in the enquiry. The point, which I maintain, is, that these letters *all* pass so constantly and familiarly into each other, whatever may be the precise mode by which this process of change is effected, that any division of these Consonants into separate Classes, as forming separate races of words, is entirely foreign to the purposes of the Etymologist, and is even subversive of his art. This idea, which I have given on the affinity of *all* these letters to each other, does not lead to a confusion of the differences, which exist between them, any more than a similar idea entertained by the Etymologists, respecting the affinity between letters composing a certain class. Though we alike maintain the affinity between certain letters, we still acknowledge their difference, and understand the important purposes produced by that difference. The phraseology, which we adopt to describe the property of letters, is similar to that which is applied to the purposes of Life. In the affinity between animals, it is not understood, that those animals are the same, but that they are different and distinct individuals, of the same kind or species, connected with each other by certain bonds of resemblance or relation. From the difference between such letters

letters is derived a great source of variety in the formation of different words containing similar ideas in the same Language, or of the same words in different Languages or Dialects. It is in fact to this principle of affinity between certain Consonants that we owe the effects of Variety and Difference, which those letters have produced; as from this Affinity it has arisen, that such Consonants have readily and familiarly passed into each other, and therefore that these differences have been exhibited.

It is marvellous to observe, how the separation of these Consonants C, D, G, &c. into distinct classes, has confounded and embarrassed all the efforts of the Etymologist in the prosecution of his Art. The very attempt to distinguish one Class from another seems to have formed an unsurmountable barrier to his enquiries, though every Etymologist has expressly stated, that these Classes pass into each other; and has in reality tacitly allowed the operation of the principle in its fullest extent, as he could not proceed a step in the exercise of his art, without acknowledging so manifest a fact, perpetually recurring, in the most ordinary and familiar examples, which passed under his view. Nothing new is advanced in this enquiry, respecting these Consonants C, D, G, &c., but the direct, plain, and explicit declaration of the principle, that they all regularly and familiarly pass into each other, to the exclusion of the rest, and that any separation of them into different classes, however just it may be under some points of view, serves only to blind and pervert the understanding in the researches of Etymology. There is nothing new likewise in my idea respecting the Vowels, that they *all* pass familiarly and promiscuously into each other, without any laws of exclusion or distinction; and, moreover, that they afford no records of affinity; but the plain and explicit mode, in which this fact has been declared, and the purposes, to which a truth thus unequivocally stated, as an indispensible principle in the

Art,

Art, is afterwards applied. The Etymologists, in their details of the changes of Vowels into each other, have in fact shewn, that they all pass into each other, and therefore that no such distinction exists; and in producing the parallel terms, whose affinity they acknowledge, where *all* the vowels have been adopted, they tacitly allow, that the vowels afford no records to determine the affinity of those words, as distinguished from other words. They at the same time tacitly acknowledge, that the Consonants alone afford this record; and thus, nothing is new in my conception, that Consonants are the *Essential* and *Elementary* Parts of words, but the express mode, in which this principle has been declared, and the comprehensive manner, in which it has been applied. All the Etymologists do, in fact, I must again repeat, tacitly acknowledge it; and even some hardy Theorists have, from time to time, ventured to assert, that Consonants were the Radical parts of words. Still, however, nothing has been accomplished on this foundation. The principle has been applied to no purposes of a general nature, nor has it afforded the basis of a regular System, illustrated and confirmed by a series of examples.—That part of my Hypothesis may however be considered as perfectly new, in which it is maintained, that Languages have been derived from certain names, under different Elements, denoting the EARTH, *Ground,* &c. On the whole, I might venture to affirm, that this idea, unfolded as it is by a *new* mode of applying principles, which were before inadequately conceived, may be considered as affording to the subject of Etymology an *art altogether new*, and totally unlike, in its form and purposes, to every other mode, which has ever been adopted in discovering the affinity of words.

The Observations, which Skinner has made on the nature of the Vowels and Consonants, will sufficiently point out the mode, in which other Etymologists have considered the subject. On the

the Vowels he observes, " Vocales omnes in omnibus Linguis facilè " invicem commutantur, hæ autem illis arctiori affinitatis vinculo, " saltem apud aliquas gentes, conjunctæ videntur, ut A cum O, " præsertim in Linguâ Teutonicâ, U cum O, præsertim in Linguâ " Latinâ, et vocibus Latinis in Italicam Linguam commigrantibus, " E in A, saltem sono, idque perpetuò in vocibus Franco-Gallicis, " ubi sc. E præcedit N Consonam, ut in *Commencer*, *Agencer*, " &c. quæ ut A plenum efferuntur." After this declaration, that the Vowels in all Languages are easily changed into each other, it would seem to be an idle task to shew, in separate articles, that each Vowel passes into all the others. Skinner, however, has bestowed six Folio pages to shew into what Vowels A has been changed, or, in other words, to shew that it has passed into all the rest, with their various combinations. He has bestowed, likewise, seven Folio pages to prove the same thing respecting the vowel E. Though the pale of separation has in fact been compleatly removed by the declaration that all the Vowels in all Languages are easily changed into each other; yet it is marvellous to observe how the barrier is again erected by this laborious detail of the examples, which, though it proves the fact, seems to produce a contrary impression on the mind of the Reader. On the Consonants, Skinner observes, " Consonantes ferè omnes sibi in hâc vel illâ " Linguâ aliquando cedunt, hæ autem longè rariùs quam illæ: " quædam in omnibus, quædam tantùm in hâc vel illâ Linguâ " bellum quasi implacabile inter se gerunt. Cognatæ maxi- " mè sunt B et V consona, B et F, F et V consona, V consona " et W, D et T, B et V præsertim in vocibus Teutonicis, C " seu K et G, N et L, S et T, Digamma Æolicum F et " V consona, J consona et G, Z et T, præsertim in Dialectis " Teutonicâ et Belgicâ. Reliquæ cæterarum consonantium per- " mutationes minùs proclives et rariores sunt, interdum tamen

"occurrunt, idque manifestiùs quàm ut à viro cordato rejici "possint." If we learn little from this arrangement, we learn still less from the detail of the changes of each Consonant. B he tells us is changed into D, F, G, J, M, P, R, V; the letter C into CK, F, G, H, J, K, P, Q*u*, S, T, T*ch*, V, X, Z, &c. and D is changed, as he tells us, into B, C*h*, G, L, N, P, R, S, T, V, X, Z. It will not be necessary, I imagine, to proceed further in the detail of these changes; as we can only learn from hence, that all the Consonants pass into each other. Thus the Reader will perceive, in considering this detail of the changes of each Consonant, that I differ from the Etymologists not by enlarging the former limits of change, but by contracting them within a sphere, more bounded, distinct, and defined. We perceive, moreover, that in these two modes of arrangement the Etymologists have fallen into errors most destructive to their art. By dividing into separate classes certain Consonants, related to each other, they have destroyed the comprehensiveness of their principles, and secluded from their art all ideas respecting that wide affinity, which exists between extensive Families or Races of words. In their second arrangement, when they detail to us how *all* the Consonants pass into each other, they have destroyed the foundation of their art, by confounding all distinctions, and obliterating thereby those records of affinity, by which words are recognised to be related to each other, as distinguished from other words.

Before I finish my observations on the Cognate Consonants C, D, G, &c. I cannot forbear observing, that one of the Greek verbs which I have above produced, in order to unfold the affinity of those Consonants, is singularly adapted to the illustration of my Hypothesis. I shall shew, in the course of these discussions, that ORUSSO, or ORUTTO, (Ορυσσω, Ορυττω,) (Fodio,) To Dig, belongs to EARTH, AIRTHA, &c. and that it means, in its original sense,

To

To EARTH, or To Stir up the EARTH or Ground. When the Reader perceives, that the Element ^RT assumes the various forms of ^RS, ^RG, ^RX, and ^RK, in one and the same word, which expresses the action of Digging among the Greeks, as ORUTT, ORUSS, ORUG, ORUX, ORUK, or ORT, ORS, ORG, ORX, ORK, he will not wonder at the mutations, which I have supposed to be annexed to our Element, in words passing through various Languages or Dialects. He will be prepared to understand, what he will find in the succeeding pages, that the Greek ERG-*on*, and the English terms *w*-ORK, *w*-RIGHT, Opifex, in Saxon *w*-RIGHTA, *w*-YRHTA, different in form as they may appear, are derived from Operations performed on the EARTH. The Saxon verb, to which *w*-ORK belongs, *w*-YRC*an*, Operari, becomes, in one of its tenses, *w*-ORHT*e*, Elaboravit; where we have a similar change from ^RC to ^RT. In Lye's Saxon Dictionary we have the following phrases, " EORT*han* WYRC*an*, Terram Elaborare, Colere,— " Man næs the tha EORT*han* WORHT*e*, Homo non erat qui terram " coleret;" where the term *w*-ORK is brought to its original Spot, and connected with the very word EARTH from which it is derived. These examples of the Greek ORUTTO, (Ορυττω,) and the Saxon *w*-YRC*an*, will at once illustrate the familiar changes of these Commutable Consonants, and the principles of my hypothesis. The Reader will in fact perceive, that I demand in my hypothesis no greater latitude of change, when a word has passed through millions of mouths in different ages and regions of the world, than that which takes place in the same dialect of the same Greek verb.

The wide compass of Human Speech, through which this Element ^R. R.^. --- C, D, &c., denoting the EARTH, &c. has extended its influence, will be understood only from an attentive consideration of the succeeding discussions: yet I might here briefly state the comprehensive scale of research, by which that influence

influence has been illustrated. I might venture to assert, with as much precision as the case demands, that I have examined *all** the ordinary and familiar terms, belonging to this Element, which

* By the expression, "*all* the terms," I mean to say, that no selection was made in those Languages of the terms, which were supposed most aptly to coincide with the hypothesis of the writer, but that some one of the ordinary Dictionaries in those Languages was regularly examined;—that *all* the Radical terms in familiar use were noted with sufficient accuracy; and that they are here presented to the attention of the Reader. When the purpose of this examination is duly understood, it will be sufficiently manifest, to what a degree of minuteness the writer is bound by duty to extend his researches. The examination was made for the purpose of comprehending in the discussion the Radical terms, belonging to the Element, which performed the most important part in each Language; and it was rendered thus extensive, in order to remove every idea of a selection of certain words favourable to the support of an hypothesis. When the writer had taken due care to guard against this idea, he did not charge himself with a scrupulous minuteness, which would have retarded rather than have advanced the object of these researches. Having thus stated, that I do not charge myself with a minuteness of detail, which would in fact be foreign to the purpose of my argument, I might venture, I think, to affirm, that the greater part of the Radical important words, belonging to our Element in every Language, above recited, have been noted with a diligence, which would probably not have been always adopted even in an Etymological work, professedly written for each of these Languages. Many words are of such a nature, as the names of Plants, Animals, &c. that they can only be referred to their original idea by the adepts in each Language, who must exert all their knowledge in the history of that Language, and of the customs of the people, by whom it is spoken. This remark might be extended even to the ordinary and familiar terms in every form of Speech, which require the skill and science of a Master in each peculiar form, in order to detect their original and primitive meanings; without the knowledge of which, the efforts of the Etymologist would be vain and unavailing. The writer therefore of the present work will be thought perhaps to have much exceeded the limits of his province and his powers, in attempting to make any arrangement of so comprehensive a nature as to include *all* the ordinary and familiar words of a certain class in such a variety of Languages, however loosely and imperfectly that arrangement may have been made. Some perhaps will be of opinion likewise, that too great minuteness ought not to have been adopted in a general work of this nature, even if the knowledge of the writer had been duly adequate to the task of performing it with effect. They will think, perhaps, that in a work on the general facts of Etymology, as discoverable in various forms of Speech, a *selection* only ought to have been made of such words in each Language, which most pointedly and strongly illustrated the main scope and tenor of the argument; and that the discussion

which occur in the *Gothic*, *Saxon*, *English*, *German*, *Italian*, *Spanish*, *French*, *Welsh*, *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Latin* Languages. A perpetual appeal has been made to the *Arabic* Language; and the

---

cussion ought not to have been encumbered with a minute detail of other terms, which must tend to disturb and embarrass the attention of the general reader, who is only interested in the great outlines of the subject, and not in obscure researches belonging to the peculiarities of each Language. This objection has, in my opinion, considerable weight, and might be turned to a profitable account, at least with respect to the mode in which the work should be arranged. It might perhaps be at once provided, by a certain arrangement, that the Student in each Language could find materials of enquiry particularly connected with the form of Speech in which he was interested, while the general reader should not be diverted from the main drift of the subject by the minuteness of details, foreign to the great and leading points of the argument. In the present volume I shall consider various words in the Index of my work, and in a future volume this mode of arrangement might be carried to a greater extent. Though the Alphabetical order is in general useful only for the purpose of directing the Reader to the spot in which a word is to be found, and ought not to be adopted in a work on Etymology, which professes to unfold a series of words, connected with each other by the same train of ideas; yet in some cases even this arrangement may be properly adopted. Those words, whose senses are insulated, and remote from the general train of ideas conveyed by the Element, may be properly referred to the Alphabetical arrangement of an Index, in which they would be at once removed from the body of the work, and yet might be consulted by those who were interested in the enquiry. Even the form of a Note, placed at the bottom of a page, might sometimes supply a convenient mode of representing certain things, which it would be right perhaps to record, but which all would not be desirous to read. In attempting this detailed review of words through so many Languages; though I am persuaded that the words, which I have examined, fall within the pale of my hypothesis; yet it may too often happen, I fear, that my want of knowledge in the secrets of some of the various Languages here examined, has caused me to mistake the intermediate idea, by which the word is connected with the general sense of the Element. It is only in a few Languages that any Individual can hope to perform, in a comprehensive manner, the part of an Etymologist with precision and effect; and he, who should presume to attempt this task, would betray his ignorance of the first principles on which his art is founded. Nothing can be done, unless the original idea annexed to words be discovered; and this cannot be performed without a profound knowledge of the Language investigated, or such assistances which are not often to be found or easy to be obtained. Nothing can be done, I must again repeat, unless the various senses of a word are accurately studied, as they appear in sentences where the word is used in conjunction with other words.

From

the *Chaldee*, *Samaritan*, and *Syriac* Dialects have been familiarly produced. I might almost venture to affirm, that the *Irish* and *Galic* Dialects of the Celtic have been examined with equal diligence as the *Welsh*. The *Persian* has been cited on every occasion, which, as far as my knowledge of the Language extended, was supposed to afford a due topic of illustration to the subject of my Enquiry. When we consider, that the *Gothic*, *Saxon*, *English*, and *German* Languages have been thus regularly examined, and learn, moreover, that a constant reference has been made to the corresponding terms in *Dutch*, *Danish*, *Swedish*, *Runic*, &c. as recorded by the Etymologists, I may confidently affirm, that *all* the Radicals, belonging to our Element, in *all* the

---

From hence only can be discovered the peculiar turn of meaning annexed to each word, and that genuine idea with which it was originally invested. Though a diligent study of the authors in each Language is best calculated to supply us with this species of knowledge in its highest state of perfection, yet other modes of information may be summoned to our aid, and be adopted with sufficient effect. Great and essential benefit might be derived from a Lexicon, judiciously arranged, which should abound with examples, most literally and faithfully translated, illustrating the various senses of a word, and which should state likewise all that was known on the history and origin of that word. With no other knowledge of a Language than that which a Grammar and a Lexicon of this nature would afford me, I could venture to investigate the secrets of that Language, and to perform the part of an Etymologist, with safety, and with success. Every Language should be supplied with a Dictionary of this kind; and it should always be accompanied with a Grammar. The labours of the Student in Elementary Language would be infinitely abridged, if the unknown characters of a Language were rejected for characters more known. Though in Languages, where our means of information are less perfect, we shall be oftentimes unable to discover by what intermediate idea a great variety of terms are connected with our Element; yet we may still be enabled to ascertain, that the force of the Element prevails in those Languages, and that they are alike to be considered as falling within the pale of our hypothesis. A few strong and striking examples will establish this fact; and it is with this fact alone that the writer of the present work is concerned. When that has been well and sufficiently ascertained, the duty of the writer may be said to terminate: and all that he performs more, he does it in the abundance of his zeal, as labouring rather in the cause of his hypothesis, than as performing a task necessary for its confirmation.

the Dialects of the Teutonic, have been considered in these Enquiries. I might safely, I think, observe likewise, that the mode, in which the Hebrew Language has been examined, and the frequent appeal to the *Arabic*, *Chaldee*, *Samaritan*, and *Syriac*, have supplied *all* or *most* of the Radical words, belonging to our Element, which exist in those kindred Dialects. It will be acknowledged, I imagine, that in the *Welsh*, the *Galic*, and the *Irish* Dialects, are contained all the Radical words, which are to be found in the Celtic forms of Speech; and thus we may assert the same fact, which we have affirmed of the Teutonic Dialects. By the *Radical* words of an Element in certain Dialects, I mean the uncompounded words, exhibiting the more distinct and leading ideas, conveyed by the Element, in these Dialects. Such Radical words may be considered as pervading these Dialects, and supplying in each Dialect different senses, and different derivative words, by some variations of the Radical or leading ideas. When I have brought, therefore, these Radical words, with their leading ideas, within the pale of my hypothesis, I may be justly said to have proved the truth of my hypothesis in those Dialects. The Etymologists in each Language or Dialect will find but little difficulty in arranging the subordinate divisions of derivative terms, when the more Radical words, or those which appear to convey the more leading ideas, distinct and separate from each other, have been referred to one common notion, and their affinity has been thus unravelled and ascertained. I shall not enumerate the various other Languages, which I have occasionally exhibited for the illustration of my hypothesis, as the Dialects of the Sclavonic, *Russian*, &c. the *Sanscrit*, *Gipsey*, *Coptic*, &c.; as the Reader will fully understand, from what has been already observed, that my hypothesis is supported on the most firm and ample basis.

My anxious desire to explain most perspicuously the principal points of my theory on the very spot, in which the

the examples themselves are produced, has led me perhaps to extend these preliminary observations beyond their due limits. I shall now however proceed to the discussion of those examples, and shall return to the consideration of the articles in Skinner and Junius, in which the parallel terms for the EARTH are produced, as AIRTHA (Goth.) EARD, EORD, &c. (Sax.) &c. &c. Junius records the Teutonic name for the EARTH, as we find it in Tacitus; "HERTHÆ meminit Tacitus de Germanorum Moribus, c. 40. "ubi ait, 'In commune HERTHAM, id est, *Terram* matrem colunt, "'eamque intervenire rebus hominum, invehi populis arbitrantur.'" In other copies of Tacitus we have *Herthum*, *Nerthum*, *Verthum*; but Lipsius thinks that it should be *Aerthum*, "Ita enim nostratem "eam vocem efferimus, scribimus. Cum adspiratione focum nobis "signet, non Terram." Some think that it should be read "*Erdamm*, i. e. *Erdamme*, ex *Erd* et *Amme*, Mater, Nutrix, "(Hesych. Αμμα, Μητηρ, τροφος,)—quia Tacitus interpretatur Terra "*Mater*." If the translation of Tacitus be precise, the latter portion of the word *Hertham*, or *Erdamm*, must signify Mother. The terms *Herthum*, *Erdamm*, or *Herth*-Thum, *Erd*-Damm, might then be considered as compounds of EARTH and *Dam*, or *Dame*, Mother; or if it be not a literal translation, the TM, or DM, might signify the Ground, and be employed in a similar manner as the *Thum* and *Dom* in German and English, in Fursten-*Thum*, King-*Dom*, the Land or *Dom*ain of the Prince or King. The union of ERDE and *Thum*, terms bearing a similar meaning, in *Herthum*, will then be of the same kind as that of ERDE and *Boden*, the Ground or Soil, in ERD*boden*, or of ERDE and *Reich*, "Realm, "Kingdom," in ERD*reich*, "the EARTH, Soil, Ground, Land." The Saxon YRTH gives us another form of these terms EARTH, &c. denoting the *Land*, &c. Lye explains this word by "EARTH. "Fundus arabilis, Ager novalis, agri proventus." Skinner observes, under EARTH, "Si Græcus essem, deflecterem à Gr. Ερα, Terra,

"unde

"unde adverbium Ενερθε, νερθε, Infra, inferiùs;" and to this he has added the Gothic phrase *Ana Airtha*, In Terra. The Greek *Era*, (Ερα, Terra,) will be explained in another place. The form *Enerthe* would lead us to suppose, that it corresponded exactly with the Gothic *Ana Airtha*, and with the English *On Earth*; yet I believe, that *Enerthen*, (Ενερθεν,) to which *Enerthe*, (Ενερθε,) belongs, should be considered as the original form, and that the word is compounded of *En*, *Era*, and the particle *Then*, (Εν, Ερα, Θεν,) as we see in the word *Eneroi*, (Ενεροι, Inferi,) the manifest origin of *En* and *Era*, (Εν, Ερα.) Skinner records the Saxon EARD*ian*, or EARD*igan*, "Habitare," which signifies, as we see, To EARTH, or to be fixed in a certain Spot of EARTH or Land; and he produces likewise a word, which occurs in Gl. Lips. ORD*on*, Habitabat, where the ORD, we see, is another form of EARTH. The Etymologists have referred to *Enerthe*, (Ενερθε,) and *Hertha*, the Goddess, our English word HEARTH, which we shall now understand to mean nothing but the EARTH or *Ground*. It is curious, that the Etymologists could not come at once to the EARTH, in their derivation of this word, except through the medium of *Enerthe*, (Ενερθε,) and *Hertha*. The parallel terms to HEARTH, or HEORTH, HERTH, as it is represented by Junius, are *Heorth*, (Sax.) *Herd*, (Germ.) *Haerd*, *Heert*, *Hert*, (Belg.) &c., which the Etymologists have recorded, who have likewise produced the Greek ESTIA, (Εστια, Focus,—Lar,—Domus,—Vesta,) the HEARTH, and the Goddess of the EARTH. We perceive, that in ESTIA, (Εστια,) the *r* in the Radical ^*r*S, ^*r*T, has been lost; and we see likewise, that in the Latin *v*-ESTA, the vowel breathing before the Elementary consonant ^S has passed into the sound of a Labial consonant. The term HEARTH affords, I believe, almost the only instance, in which our English Etymologists have referred a term to the EARTH; and even here, we see, it is indirectly done.

Terms

Terms derived from the idea of the Peculiar or Appropriate Place — the *Enclosed* or *Secured* Spot of *Land* or EARTH —the EARTH, by way of distinction.

YARD. (Eng.) A certain peculiar Spot of *Land*,—and a Measure, as of a certain Piece of *Land*, &c.

YARD-*Land*. (Eng.) A certain Measure or Quantity of *Land*.

ERISH. (Arab.) A *Yard*, Cubit.

v-IRGA. (Lat.) The *Land*, and the Measure, the Rod, &c.

v-ERGE, *v*-ERGA. (Fr. Ital.) The Rod, &c.

v-ERGE. (Eng.) The Boundary.

v-ERGER. (Fr.) An *Orchard*.

g-ARTH. (Provincial Dialect.) A *Yard*, Area, &c.

g-EARD. (Sax.) *Yard*, the *Earth*, Sepes, Mundus, Terra.

g-ARDEN, *j*-ARDIN, *g*-IARDINO, *g*-ARDIN, *g*-AERD, *g*-AARD, *g*-ARTE, *g*-ARTEN, *g*-ARDD, &c. (Eng. Fr. Ital. Span. Belg. Dan. Germ. Welsh.)

g-UARD—*w*-ARD. (Eng.) To Secure, as by an *Enclosure*.

g-ARDER, *g*-UARDARE, *g*-UARDAR. (Fr. Ital. Span.) To *Guard*.

w-EARDAN, *w*-AERDEN, *w*-ARTEN, *w*-ARDJAN, *v*-ARDA. (Sax. Belg. Germ. Goth. Island.) To *Ward*.

ARTH. (Welsh.) A *Yard*, *Enclosure*.

h-ORTUS, ORTO. (Lat. Ital.)

ORT. (Germ.) Place, a Part.

ORTS. (Eng.) Parts, Pieces, originally of *Land*.

ORDA. (Irish.) A Piece, Fragment.

ORCH-ARD, (Eng.)

ORCHATOS. (Gr.) Pomarium.

ORCE-ARD, ORC-YRD, ORT-*g*-EARD. AURTI-*g*-ARDS. (Sax. Goth.) An *Orchard*, *Garden*, &c.

WE have seen, that the vowel breathing before the Radical ^RT sometimes passes into an *Aspirate* Breathing, and is represented by *h*, as *h*-ERTHA; and sometimes, when the sound is still more thickened, it is converted into the power and form of a Consonant, as in the Saxon *g*-EARD, the Danish *j*-ORD, *j*-ORDEN. We shall see other forms, which this vowel breathing has assumed; and I shall consider all the terms, under these various forms, which I conceive to be directly connected with the Radical ^RT. The Danish *j*-ORD will bring us to the English *y*-ARD, where we have another state of the vowel breathing; and the Saxon *g*-EARD will remind us of our term *g*-ARDEN, which only means *The* EARTH — the ERD — *j*-ORDEN, or *The Ground* — the Appropriate, Peculiar Spot of Ground, Enclosed, and Separated from the rest. From the *y*-ARD or *g*-EARD, the Appropriate Spot of Ground—*Separated* and *Enclosed* from the rest, for the purpose of *Security* and *Defence*, we have the verb of *Security* and *Defence*, GUARD, or *g*-UARD, and another form of this word, WARD, or *w*-ARD. Junius explains YARD by "Quævis Area sepimento "inclusa; *Court*-YARD, Area Curtis, *Church*-YARD, Cœmiterium, "YARD *for Poultry*, Chors." He produces, as parallels, the Saxon *Geard*, the ancient German *Gard*, the Runic *Gardr*, the Danish *Gierde*, or *Ind-Gierdet platz*, the Belgic *Gaerd:* and Lye records the Swedish *Gard*, the Gothic *Gards*, Domus, *Garda*, Ovile, which he refers to the Runic *Garda*, Sepire, Sepimento cingere. Skinner tells us, under *Garth*, that it is a Lincolnshire term for a YARD; and Mr. Grose explains it by "A YARD, a "backside, a croft. A Church-*Garth*, a Church-*Yard;* a Stock-"*Garth*, a rick-*Yard*. Also a Hoop or Band. North." Here we see the word signifies at once the Enclosed Spot of *Ground*, and

an

an *Enclosure* in general. This will remind us of *Girth, Gird, Garter,* &c.

The Saxon *g*-EARD not only means "YARD, Sepes, Sepimen-"tum," but it signifies likewise "*Mundus, Terra, Area,*" The World, a Region or Country, the EARTH. In Saxon, *Middan*-GEARD and *Middan*-EARD signify, "Mundus, Orbis terrarum," as they are interpreted by Lye. The phrase "*Middle* EARTH" still remained in the English Language. In the *Merry Wives of Windsor* we have "I smell a man of *Middle* EARTH," (A. V. S. 5.): on which Mr. Steevens observes, "So, in the ancient metrical "romance of *Syr Guy of Warwick,* bl. l. no date:

"Thou mayst them slea with dint of swearde,
"And win the fayrest mayde of *Middle* ERDE.

"Again, in Gower, *De Confessione Amantis,* fol. 26:

"Adam, for pride, lost his price
"In *Myddell* ERTH."

Mr. Malone observes on this passage, in the Appendix to his Edition of Shakspeare; "*Middle* EARTH, says the Glossarist to Gawin "Douglas's Translation of Virgil, is only this EARTH, ab A. S. "*Myddan* EARD, Mundus." There is a well known passage of Cædmon, preserved by Alfred, in which *Middan*-GEARD occurs, and which affords a sufficient specimen of our Saxon Poetry. "Tha "middan GEARD, Mon cynnes weard, Ece drihtne, Æfter teode, "Firum foldan, Frea almihtig."—'The middle EARTH or Region, 'The Ward or Guardian of Man-Kind, The Eternal Lord, Afterwards 'produced, As the Field or Ground for Men, The Almighty 'Master.' Lye translates it thus; "Tum orbem terrarum humani "generis custos, æternus Dominus creavit, hominibus terræ "Dominus omnipotens." The translation of Lye, "*Terræ* "Dominus," appears not to be correct. Lye, in his Edition of Junius, produces the phrase *Middill*-ERD, as used by Gawin Douglas, &c. He explains it by "Terrarum orbis, orbis habita-

"bilis,

" bilis, οικουμενη, q. d. illud totius universi medium, quod incolunt " homines.—Ab A. S. *Middan-Eard*, vel *Middan-Geard*, Mundus. " Alamannis est *Mittel-Gart*. Gothis, *Midju-Gards*. a *Midjus*. " Medius, et *Gards*. Domus."

The word YEARD or *y*-EARD, Virga, the Rod, was originally applied to a measure of the EARTH, or *Land*; as we see it in the combination YARD-*Land*, " Virga, seu virgata terræ." When this term is used for the measure of a Rod or Stick, it is called YARD-*Wand*, and now simply YARD. Let us note the term *Rod*, and consider its resemblance to *Rood:* I shall shew in a future page, that they both belong to each other and to the form of the Element RD, denoting the EARTH, ERDE, &c. In Arabic, ارش ERISH signifies " A YARD, cubit, span, palm." The Latin *Pertica* means at once a Staff and a Measure of Land—a *Perch*; and let us mark the explanatory words of Junius, the " VIRGA seu " VIRGATA *Terræ*" We shall now see, that *v*-IRGA is only another form of these words denoting the EARTH, ARZ, ARK. (Heb. Chald.) In *v*-IRGA, the vowel breathing before the Radical has passed into a labial sound. VIRGA, the Rod, appears in the French *Verge*, the Italian *Verga*, &c. We know, that *Verge* has the sound of *Verdge*; and thus we see a combination of the sounds *D* and *G*, and learn one mode by which the *D* and the *G* pass into each other. The *Verger*, the Apparitor, is the person, who carries the *Virga*, or Staff. VERGE, in the sense of the *Boundary*—" within the VERGE of the Court," brings us directly to the idea of the *Enclosed*—appropriate or separate Spot—EARTH, ERDE, &c. The Etymologists, Junius and Skinner, do not appear to have produced the word in this sense. Junius however exhibits the word VERGER for " Hortus, Viridarium," as used by Chaucer; where we again unequivocally see the appropriate—separated Spot of Ground. Junius records as parallel terms, the Italian *Verziere*, and the Spanish *Vergel*; and he imagines, that it properly signifies

" Locus

" Locus *Virgis* consitus, Lieu planté de *Verges*;" though Skinner, in one of his Vocabularies, observes, that VERGE, the Garden, is " quantum—*Virgâ* seu Radio definiunt, et metiuntur " circa domum." He has another article for *Vergere*, the term in Chaucer, which he refers to the French *Vergier*, now written *Verger*, the Orchard. Some imagine, that the VERGE of the King's Court is so called from the VERGE or Staff, which the Marshal bears, and which denotes the power and jurisdiction of the Lord High Steward of the King's Household within those limits. VERGE has another sense in English, belonging to the Latin VERGO, To bend, or decline *downwards*, VERG*it* ad *Imum*, where *v*-ERGE—*v*-ERDG*e* signifies To EARTH, or To tend to the EARTH, ERDE, &c. Martinius rightly understands, that this word would be most naturally taken from the *Ground;* and he derives it accordingly from ερα and αγω, quasi, Εραζε αγομαι. In Hebrew, a term with this meaning appears under a more simple form. In this Language ירד IRD means " To descend, go, or come down." Mr. Parkhurst has justly compared this word with רדה RDH, " To descend, come, or go down," where the breathing before the R is lost.—The explanatory word *Viridarium* belongs, we know, to VIRID*is*; and the Reader will now understand, that *v*-IRID*is*, *v*-ERD*ure*, *v*-ERT, (Fr.), Green, are attached to the EARTH, ERDE, (Germ.) &c. the object of all others, from which, as we should have imagined, à priori, the word would have arisen. I shall shew in a future Volume, that *Green* belongs to *Ground.*

GARD*en*, *g*-ARD-*Den*, appears in various Languages, as in the French *Jardin*, the Italian *Giardino*, the Spanish *Gardin*, the Belgic *Gaerd*, the Danish *Gaard*, the German *Garte*, *Garten*, the Welsh *Gardd*, &c., which the Etymologists record, who produce moreover the Gothic *Aurti-Gards*, An *Orchard.* They likewise remind us of the terms WARD and GUARD and YARD, which, as we

we have seen, all belong to each other. We see, that GARDEN has a similar form to JORDEN, the Danish name for the EARTH. The *N* in these words might be only an organical addition to the *D;* yet the *Den* may be significant, and may belong to a great race of words to be found through the whole compass of Language. The Element, to which it is attached, may be represented by $\overline{\text{DG}}$-N, $\overline{\text{DC}h}$-N, $\overline{\text{TC}h}$-N, denoting the Earth. We shall call to mind the Greek C*h*T*h*ON, (Χθων, Terra,); from which we shall at once see, how the forms CN, TN, DN, &c. arise. Under the form CN we have *Country*, *County*, &c.; and under DN, TN, we have *Town*, the *Din* in 'Lon-*Din*-Um,' &c. &c. In the Eastern Languages, the terms for a *Garden*, or 'Gard-*Den*,' are found under this Element; as, *Junnut*, (Arab. جنت), *Gan*, (Heb. גן); and hence we have the *Den* in *Eden*. The Hebrew גן GN, as a verb, signifies "To Protect, Defend." *Gorne* is a term in old English for a *Garden;* as in the Poems attributed to Rowley, (Eclogue I. 36.) This will remind us of the Enclosure of the Barn—the *Garner;* and the form of these words will bring us to the *Ground*, the original Spot. We have seen, that in Welsh, GARDD is a *Garden;* and in the same column of Mr. Richards' Dictionary, where this word occurs, we have GARTH, "A mountain or hill, a "promontory or cape. Hence *Llu*ARTH, A place on a hill where "an army hath rested or remained for some time; *Penn*ARTH, in "N.W. *Penn*ARDD, *Gog*ARTH, *Llwydi*ARTH. Bid lâs *Llu*ARTH. P. "i. e. Let the place be green, where an army hath been." *Garth*, or *g*-ARTH, the *Hill*, means only the distinguished EARTH—Spot—or Place—the High Spot. In the compounds we see the true form ARTH, ARDD; and we may likewise learn, that the words are used in their more simple sense for a *Place*. Hence Mr. Richards has justly explained *Llu*-ARTH by the *Place*, where an army has been. The same Lexicographer has derived *Buarth* from *Bu*, the Ox, and *Garth*; and he has justly explained *Bu*-ARTH by

by the " YARD or *Place* by a House where cows are turned to be " milked, a *Place* to fold cattle, a fold or pen."

GUARD appears in the French *Garder*, the Italian *Guardare*, the Spanish *Guardar*, &c. Skinner next to GARD has the nautical term *Garboord*, which, he says, is quasi *Gardboord*, Asser Muniens, from *Gard* and *Boord*. In modern English, GUARD has the sense of protection, without particularly recurring to the idea of *Security*, as arising from an *Enclosure*. In old English it sometimes simply denoted an *Enclosure* or *Border*, without any notion of protection; and hence our term *Black*-GUARD is derived. GUARD in ancient Language means the *Border* of a Garment. So in Shakspeare:

" *Isab.* O! 'tis the cunning livery of Hell,
" The damned'st body to invest, and cover
" In princely GUARDS." *Measure for Measure*, A. III. S. 1.

" A GUARD, in old Language," says Mr. Malone, " meant a " *Welt* or *Border* of a garment; ' because ' (says Minshew) ' it " ' *Gards* and keeps the garment from tearing.' These borders " were sometimes of lace. So in the Merchant of Venice:

" Give him a livery
" More GUARDED than his fellows."

The GUARDS* or Borders on the Garments of persons dressed in

---

* GUARD in this sense occurs in other passages of Shakspeare, which the Commentators have justly noticed. Yet there is one passage in the *Lover's Complaint*, where we can scarcely distinguish, whether the word GUARDS is used in its ordinary sense, or as applied to *Garments*. Perhaps the Reader of taste will be of opinion, that the word was forced on the attention of the Poet by the powerful fascination of the associating principle, so operative on the ardent mind, in the moments of invention. A Damsel thus complains, whose chastity had fallen a sacrifice to the arts of her lover:

" There my *white stole* of chastity I daff'd,
" Shook off my *sober* GUARDS, and *Civil* fears."

Civil

in fine cloaths, consisted of gay colours, and were of a splendid ornamental kind; while those, used by grave plain-dressing men, were commonly of *Black:* Hence was derived the contemptuous term *Black*-GUARD.—We here see, that GUARD, as applied to the ornaments of a Garment, seems at the first view but little related to the spot, from which it was taken; and thus it is, that the name of the EARTH has supplied a race of words, which in their various applications are oftentimes totally different from the ideas, which we commonly annex to their original source. In the explanatory words adopted by Mr. Malone, this idea is still further illustrated. *Border*, we know, is equally applied to the *Ground*, and to a *Garment;* and I shall shew, that it belongs to the Element BD, denoting the Earth, as *Boden*, (Germ.) *Pedon*, (Πεδον.) *Welt*, in the phrase, the *Welt* of a Garment, belongs to the German *Welt*, corresponding, in its sense and its Elementary

---

Civil is particularly applied to the *Dress.* Thus our great Poet,

"Till *Civil-suited* Morn appear,
"Not trickt and Frounct as she was wont
"With the Attic boy to hunt."

Mr. Malone, on the above passage of Shakspeare, has noted the sense of *Civil*, "Grave, decorous;" as illustrated in the following quotation, without remarking on its peculiar application to *Dress:*

"Come, *Civil* Night,
"Thou *sober-Suited* Matron, all in black." *Romeo and Juliet.*

Mr. Warton thinks, that Milton has borrowed the idea from this imagery in Shakspeare; and he produces a passage from Beaumont and Fletcher, where *Civil* "is applied to the colour of dress:"

"The fourteen yards of sattin give my woman;
"I do not like the colour, 'tis too CIVIL."
(*Woman's Prize*, A. III. S. 3. Vol. VIII. p. 221.)

There are some, who might venture to imagine, that a *Civil Suit*, as applied to *Dress*, was derived, by the operation of the associating principle, from the *Civil Suit*, the Process of Law. However quaint this conception may appear, it is by such minute operations that the human mind is affected and controuled. The "Trickt "and *Frounct*" alludes to the gawdy trimming of the GUARDS.

Elementary form, with our word *World*. The Etymologists refer *Welt* to *Wall*, and they all belong to the BL, VL, WL, the Ground, to *Vallum*, &c. &c.

Let us again mark the explanatory term *h*-ORT*us*, which must likewise be referred to this race of words, under the idea of the appropriate separate EART-*h* or Ground. In Italian, ORTO is without the *h*. The form ORT in *h*-ORT-*us* and ORTO may remind us of the German ORT, Place, which, as it will be now seen, is derived from a spot on the EART-*h*, *j*-ORD, &c. &c. From ORT, the Spot or *Piece* of Land, is taken our word ORTS, *Pieces* of any thing. Skinner derives ORTS, fragmenta, frustula, from the Belgic *Ort*, Quadrans, which probably meant a *Piece*; though Lye thinks, that it is a corruption from *Ought*, which in Devonshire is pronounced ORT. Lye too reminds us of the Irish ORDA, a Piece, fragment, which is derived from the same origin as ORT.

Let us note the explanatory term produced above, ORCH-ARD, which some conceive to be quasi *Hort-Yard*: Others conceive it to be quasi *Worts-Yard*, *Wyrt-Geard*, "Area, ubi herbæ "crescunt;" and Skinner adds, "Alludit Gr. Ορχος, Ορχατος, "Plantarum Ordo, Hortus v. YARD et GARD*en*." Junius produces the derivation of Meric Casaubon from the Homeric word ORC*hatos*, (Ορχατος, Pomarium;) and he moreover gives us the Saxon terms for HORT*us* or ORT*us*, (as he expresses it,) as ORCE-ARD, ORC-YRD, WYRT*un*, ORT-*g*-EARD. He produces likewise the following Saxon passage: "Thu EARD*ast* on ORT-"GEARD*e*, Habitas in *Horto*;" where we see the word EARD*ast* is likewise taken from the ERDE or EARTH, signifying To *Dwell*. Junius, moreover, produces the word *Orc-Erd-Weard*, denoting the *Gardener*, which literally signifies the WARD of the ORC-ERD or ORC*h*-ARD. WARD, as we have seen, is taken from the same spot; and if the Saxon passage had been "Se *Orc-Erd-Weard*

Erdath

Erdath on *Ort-Gearde*," The Gardener dwells in the Garden, we should have had in this sentence ORC, ERD, *w*-EARD, ERD, ORT, *g*-EARD*e*, all taken from the EART*h*, ERD*e*, &c.; and such is the mode, by which Languages are formed. Junius records, moreover, the Gothic AURTI-GARDS, the term for *Garden*, in the Argenteus Codex.—The Greek ORC*hatos*, (Ορχατος,) we see, has the hardened form ^RC, ^RK; and this will remind us of the Greek ERK*os*, (Ερκος, Septum, Vallum. Τα Ερκη, Rete,) the Enclosure, which the Etymologists justly refer to EIRGO, (Ειργω.) The ordinary Lexicographers make two articles of EIRGO, in its senses of To *Keep in* and To *Keep out*, (Ειργω, Includo, Conjicio in carcerem, Ειργω, Arceo, prohibeo, excludo.)

WORT, WURT, WURTLE, WYRT, WAURTS, WURTZ, WURTZEL, WORTE, WORTEL, URT, ORT. (Eng. Sax. Goth. Germ. Belg. Dan. Swed.) Herbs and Roots, the Production of the *Earth*.	WORT. (Eng.) Cerevisia mustea et tepida, the liquid fresh from the Herbs.
	WYRT-*Tun*. (Sax.) Herbarium Septum, *Hortus*.
	WARTON, quasi WYRT-*Tun*.

IN the composition *Orchard*, it is certain, that both parts, *Orch* and *Ard*, are taken from the EARTH; but there is some small difficulty about the precise meaning of the first part of this compound. The most obvious idea is, that ORCH and ARD both mean the peculiar spot of EARTH, and that they are joined together, with some minute difference of meaning; so that ORCH-ARD may signify the HORT*us*, or GARD*en* YARD, or Spot, or the ERK*os*, (Ερκος,) the *Inclosed* YARD, or something of that kind. We have seen, that *Orch-Ard* has been derived from WYRT-*Geard*, which Lye explains by "A WORT-*Yard*, ORT-*Yard*, "ORCH-*Ard*.

" ORCH-*Ard*, Herbarum Atrium, *Hortus*, Fruticetum, Pomarium." If this should be the case, ORCH must signify the *Herb*. We shall instantly agree, that WORT, WURT, WURTLE, and their parallel terms, WYRT, (Sax.) Herba, Olus, *Waurts*, (Goth.) Radix, *Wurtz*, *Wurtzel*, (Germ.) *Worte*, *Wortel*, (Belgic,) *Urt*, (Dan.) *Ort*, (Swed.) which are produced by the Etymologists, mean the EARTH's productions; the *Herbs* or *Roots* belonging to the EARTH. WORT, as applied to new beer, &c. means the liquid, fresh from the WORT, or vegetable substance, from which it is extracted. In Saxon, as we have seen, *Wyrt-Tun* is " Herbarium Septum, Hortus;" and from this compound our familiar name WARTON is derived.—The *Tun* has the same meaning, which I have attributed to the *Ten* or *Den* in *Garten*, *Garden*, &c. &c. Skinner derives WYRT, in the sense of " Cerevisia mustea et lepida," from *Work*, Fermentari, Effervescere.

WORTH, WORTHY, &c. (Eng.) What belongs to the Value of Property in *Earth* or Land.

WAIRTHS, WEORTH, WYRTHE, &c. WERTH, WURDIG, WEERD, VARD, WARDE, GWERTH. (Goth. Sax. Germ. Belg. Dan. Swed. Welsh.) *Worth*, *Worthy*.

WORTH, WORTHIG. (Saxon.) Fundus, Prædium, Agellus, &c. *Earth*, or Land.

WORTH*am*, *Bos*WORTH, *Holds*-WORTHY. (Eng.) Names of Towns, or Spots of *Earth*.

GWERTHYR. (Welsh.)

GWERYD. (Welsh.) *Earth* cast up.

GWERYDOE. (Welsh.) A Land, Country, Region.

ERJ. (Pers.) Price, *Worth*.

ERZ*iden*. (Pers.) To be *Worth*.

ARZ. (Arab.) The *Earth*, more or most *Worthy*.

WHILE

WHILE I am examining the term WORT, I cast my eyes on the adjacent terms WORTH, WORTHY, *Worship* or WORTH*ship*, which we shall at once agree to be derived from WORTH or *Value*, as annexed to property in EARTH or *Land*. WORTH, WORTHY, occur in various Languages; as in the Gothic *Wairths*, the Saxon *Weorth*, *Wyrthe*, &c. the German *Werth*, *Wurdig*, the Belgic *Weerd*, &c. the Danish *Vard*, the Swedish *Warde*, and the Welsh *Gwerth*, &c. Lye refers to these words the term produced in Hesychius, Εορτας, αρεσκυσας, καλας, "Gratas, pulchras," and Εορται, Εδοξε, "Visum est, placuit." The *Eortas*, (Εορτας,) may be another form of ARESKO, ARESO, (Αρεσκω, Αρεσω, Placeo,) which I shall consider in another place. But on this I cannot decide. The origin of WORTH and WORTHY will be placed beyond doubt, when we consider WORTH, as the adjunct to many names of Places. Skinner places WORTH with this sense in a separate article, but he justly refers us to the Saxon word WORTH. Lye, in his Saxon Dictionary, explains WORTH by "i. q. WEORTHIG, "WORTHIG, *Fundus, Prædium; — Platea, Vicus; — Atrium;*" where we see unequivocally expressed the EARTH or Land. WEORTHIG, &c. he explains by "*Prædium, Agellus;*" and to these terms he justly refers the names of Places, as WORTH*am*, *Bos*WORTH, WORTH*ington*, *Be*WORTHY, *Holds*-WORTHY. From these names of places the names of men have been taken, as *Wortham*, *Bosworth*, *Holdsworth*, *Lee-Worthy*, &c. &c. I shall not attempt to produce the various forms of these words, which are to be found in Saxon, &c. and which every one will readily refer to this source, as WEORTH*ian*, Colere, honorare, &c., which means, To regard, as an object of Value or WORTH, &c. &c. In Welsh, GWERTH signifies "Price, Value;" and the adjacent words in my Welsh Dictionary are, "GWERTHYR, A Fortification," where we are brought at once to GUARD, WARD, &c.—"GWERYD, "EARTH cast up,"—and "GWERYDOE, A Land, Country, Region,"

as

as Mr. Richards explains them. I find likewise, adjacent to these terms, GWERS, a *Verse*, which I produce for the purpose of exhibiting the power of *G* in Welsh. In Persian, ارج ERJ signifies "Price, WORTH, value, esteem, honour—ارزیش ERZISH, Price, "value, esteem, honour—ارزیدن ERZ*iden*, To be WORTH," as Mr. Richardson explains them, with other words of a similar kind. In Arabic, ارض (ARZ) ERZ, which signifies "the EARTH, "Ground, Soil, Country, Region," means likewise (ARAZ) "More "or most WORTHY."

I shall consider in this part of my work the terms belonging to our Element ^RT, ^RK, &c. denoting an Enclosure—the appropriate and peculiar Spot of EARTH—Set apart—and Secured by fences, &c. from the Land about it. I shall not omit, however, to consider other terms belonging to our Element, which present themselves to my attention, though they convey a different idea. I shall likewise chiefly consider in this Volume those terms, belonging to the Element ^RT, ^RD, which commence with a vowel, simple, or aspirated. When the aspirate becomes converted into a Consonant, we shall then have a race of words, belonging to the Element CRT, GRD, which are to be found through the whole compass of Language, and which will form the materials of another Volume. We have seen in the interpretation of YARD, "*Court*-Yard, Area *Curtis*—Yard for Poultry, *Chors*," where we may mark the terms COURT, CURTIS, CHORS, which belong to the Element CRT, CRS; and we see in *c-h*-ORS how ORS may pass into *h*-ORS, and into *ch*-ORS. These, as I observed, will be considered in another Volume; yet still I shall not fail to note in the present Volume some of those words under the Consonant form C, G.---^RS, which are directly connected with the Vowel form ^RS. We shall instantly understand, that to the form of GUARD, &c. belong GARRET, GARITE, (Fr.) Propugnaculi turris, GARTER, GIRD, GIRTH, &c. &c.

WARD,

WARD, WEARDAN, WARDJAN, WARTEN, VARDA. (Eng. Sax. Goth. Germ. Island.)

Aware, Wary, Beware. (Eng.) To be upon your *Guard*, or *Ward*.

WARGAN, *Warian, Bewarian.* (Sax.) Cavere, Defendere.

Waren, Bewaren. (Belg.)

Wær. (Sax.) Septum.

WERDAN, *Wæran.* (Sax.) To *Guard*.

Wæring-Wic. (Sax.)

Warwick. Aggere munitus vicus.

Waring, Warren. (Eng.) Names.

WERIGAN. (Sax.) Defendere.

Warn. (Eng.)

Wærnian, &c. *Warnen, Waernen, Warna, Varna.* (Sax. Germ. Belg. Swed. Isl.) Prohibere, Inhibere.

Warn-Store. (Chauc.) Fortify.

Warren. (Eng.) The Secure place for Rabbits.

Warrant, Garantir, Guarantire, Gwrant. (Eng. Fr. Ital. Welsh.)

Warenian. (Sax.) Tueri.

Wares. (Eng.) Merchandise, *Warranted* Goods.

Ware, Waere, Waar. (Sax. Belg. Germ.) *Wares.*

Wahren. (Germ.) To be *Wary*, or On your *Guard*, so as to Hold out, &c.

WARD occurs under a similar form in various Languages, as in the Saxon *Weardan*, Vigilare, custodire, tueri, the Belgic *Waerden*, the German *Warten*, Expectare, the Gothic *Wardjan*, the Islandic *Varda*, which the Etymologists produce. As *Guardian* belongs to *Guard*, so *Warden* does to *Ward*. The term *Ward* sometimes signifies, we know, Pupillus, the person *in the Ward*, or care of another. The Etymologists produce, moreover, under WARD, *Garder*, &c., as likewise the Saxon *Warian, Bewarian*, the

the German *Waren*, *Wehren*, the Belgic *Waren*, *Bewaren*, which, we see, exist in the form WR, and which remind us of *Aware*, *War*, *Wary*, *Beware*. These terms must be considered, as attached to the race of words under the Element ^RD, &c. by the loss of the *D*, the second letter in the Radical *War* is used for *Beware*, in the Hunter's phrase '*War* Horse,' in addressing a Dog, &c. *Gare*, the French word, '*Gare* la chorde,' appears to be another form of *Ware*. In Saxon we have both *Warian* and WARG-*an*, which Lye explains by "To *Be-Ware*, Cavere, "vitare, defendere;" and the preceding term in the Gothic and Saxon Dictionary by this writer, is the Gothic WARJ*an*, Prohibere, Arcere. In the same column we have the Gothic WARDJ*ans*, Custodes. The sound of G is perpetually lost, as we see it in the instance before us, *War*-ian from WARG-*an*. Sometimes the record of the G is preserved in writing, as in *Burrough*, the Town, though it is lost in the sound; but in *Burrow*, the Rabbit Hole, which belongs to *Bury*, the sound of G is lost, and the letter itself likewise. *Burrow* and *Bury* belong to the Saxon *Byrigan*, where the *G* is preserved, though it is sometimes written *Birian*, where the *G* is again lost.—The words *Wary*, &c. are brought back to their true sense in the Saxon *Wær*, *Wer*, signifying the Enclosure, "Septum, Sepi-"mentum, Retinaculum," as Lye explains it. Among other things, it signifies "Septum piscatorium, vivarium, piscina. "Hodie, a WEAR." The preceding term is *Wær*, *Wary*, Cautus, &c. In the same column we have *Wære*, Fœdus, pactum, which means the *Wary* transaction, or act of Security; and likewise *Wæran*, Tueri, and WERD*ian*, Tueri, custodire, where the *D* appears. In the next column I find "*Wær-ham*. (à *Wær*, Septum.) "Munita habitatio. Hodie *War-ham* in agro Dorsetensi. *Wæring*, "*Wering*, Agger. *Wæring-Scyre*. Warwicensis Comitatus. "*Wæring-Wic*. Aggere munitus vicus. Hodie Warwick." The

Wick

Wick in *Warwick* is *Vicus*. The Sirname *Wickwar* is an inversion of *Warwick*. Such appears to have been the origin of the name of *Warwick*. It affords me a melancholy gratification, in my journey through this world of words, to arrive at my native place, and to be impressed with those various feelings, which the remembrance of such a spot naturally inspires.

The WEAR in a River means a Dam, a *Guarded* or Secured place in a River, for any purpose, either for Keeping in Fish, or Confining the Waters. Skinner improperly has two Articles of *Wear* in these senses, though he justly refers them both to terms denoting Defence, as *Werian*, (Sax.) Defendere, *Wehren*, (Germ.) *Weeren*, (Belg.) In Saxon, *Wer* or *Wær* is Septum. Lye produces under "WEAR or *Sluce*" in Junius, the Saxon *Werian*, WERIG*an*, WERG*an*, and the Gothic WARJ*an*, Prohibere, Arcere.

We must add to this race of words our English term WARN, To put any one upon his WARD or GUARD; where the *G* or *D* is lost, as in the words just produced, and the *N* is added to the *R*. The Etymologists have detailed the parallel terms in other Languages, as the Saxon *Wærnian*, *Warnian*, *Wyrnan*, the German *Warnen*, the Belgic *Waernen*, the Swedish *Warna*, the Islandic *Varna*. The Saxon WYRNAN signifies "Prohibere, vetare, impedire," which we see is To WARD off, as we express it; and this agrees with the sense of WARN in English, in the expression "To WARN a person off your land," where the word is adopted in its more original idea. The Saxon word likewise signifies "Denegare, recusare, renuere;" and hence Junius has compared it with the Greek ARN*oumai*, (Ἀρνέομαι, *ουμαι*, Recuso, nego, &c.); and perhaps this Greek word may belong to the terms before us. Junius likewise produces the Saxon word *Wearn*, or *Wearne*, which signifies 'Obstaculum.' The succeeding term to *Warn* in Junius is WARNE*store*, WARN*store*, which, as he observes,

" Chaucero est *Strengthen, Fortify.* Item *Warnishing*, Fortifying." Here, we see, the word comes directly to its original sense, To WARD or GUARD. Among the instances, which he produces of the use of this word, are the following: " I shall WARN*store* " mine house with toures." — " WARN*ishing* of hie toures and " of hie edifices is done with grete costages." Junius moreover observes, that in ancient German, WARN*on* signifies Munire. To these terms belong our Sirnames *Warner* and *Vernon*. *Warnish* belongs more immediately to the French *Garnison*, a *Garrison*, and *Garnir*, To Furnish—" To Fortify, Strengthen.—" To *Garnish*, &c." as my Lexicographer explains it. The English *Furnish*, *Furniture*, and the French and Italian *Fournir*, *Fourniture*, *Fornir*, belong to *Warn*, *Garnir*, &c. *Furnish* is only another form of *Warnish*. The French Etymologists derive *Fournir* from Πορίζειν, Πορσαινειν, &c. Ferrari says, that the Italian *Fornir* is derived from *Ornare*, and, what is curious, that *Garnir* has the same origin. Some of the French Etymologists have derived *Garnir* from *Granum*, though others have seen its true source.—Nothing appears more remote than the idea, that *Furnish* is derived from EARTH; and it is certain, that no two words can appear more different. Nothing however is so easy as the Process, by which they are related. We have all allowed, I imagine, that *w*-ARD belongs to EARTH, AERD, &c. The Etymologists agree, that WARD, *Warian*, *Wary*, &c. belong likewise to each other. *Warn*, *Wyrnan*, *Warnish*, &c. directly connect themselves with *Warian*, &c., and *Warnish* brings us at once to *Furnish*.

WARREN, the Rabbit WARREN, the place of *Security* for Rabbits, is another form of *Wering*. In French and Belgic, *Garrene* and *Waerande* mean a *Warren*. *Warrant* is still another form of these words, and belongs to *Garantir*, (Fr.) *Guarantire*, (Ital.) and the Welsh *Gwrant*, as the Etymologists understand.

Guarantee,

Guarantee, we know, belongs to these words. Hence are derived our familiar names *Warren*, *Waring*—the Italian *Guarini*, &c. &c. The Sirname WARD, and the term of Security WARD, are written, we know, in the same manner. The preceding term To *Warrant*, in Lye's Junius, is WARRAND, which, as Lye tells us, appears in Gawin Douglas, and is explained by "Shelter, Safety." It is properly, as he observes, "Locus tutus;" and he refers us to the Saxon *Warenan*, Tueri, and the English WARD. This is all right; and yet we perceive, that the adjacent word WARRANT might have been equally produced, as a corresponding term. Our English word WARE, or *Wares* for Merchandise, with its parallel terms, *Ware*, (Sax.) *Waere*, (Belg.) *Waar*, (Germ.) *Uaru*, (Run.) *Wara*, (Swed.), is supposed by the Etymologists to belong to these terms denoting *Security* or *Assurance*, under the sense of *Warrant*, in the phrase, 'I *Warrant* the goods sound;' "quia," says Skinner, "venditores solent eas Affirmare (i. e.) "spondere eas probas esse et non adulteratas; et hoc dicitur "Belg. *Waeren*, Teut. *Wären*, a Belg. *Waer*, Teut. *Wahr*, Verus." If the German *Wahr*, 'True, certain, sure,' &c. belongs to this race of words, we must refer to the same origin the Latin VERUS. It is certain, that the German terms relate to the idea of what is well WARD*ed*—GUARD*ed*, or *Secured*, so as to remain Constant, Fixed, Certain, Sure. Hence WAHREN signifies, as my Lexicographer explains it, "To last, *Keep*, *Hold out*, continue, endure;" and he explains "*Wahr*-nehmen eines dinges" by "To be "cautious, heedful, circumspect, vigilant, watchful of a thing, "take care for it, be upon your GUARD for it, attend, mind, and "perform it."

WARD—GUARD.

WATCH. (Eng.) To have *Ward* over any thing.

WAKE. (Eng.) To be on the *Watch*.

WACHT. (Germ.) The Watch.

WACIAN, &c. WACHEN, WAECKEN. (Sax. Germ. Belg.) To *Wake*, or *Watch*.

VIGILO. (Lat.) To Watch.

WAKAN, WAKJAN, WAKA, UAKA, VAAGE, *Er*-WECKEN, (Goth. Swed. Run. Dan. Germ.) To *Wake*.

WAIT. (Eng.)

WARTEN. (Germ.) To Wait.

Re-GARD — *Re*-GARDER, &c. (Eng. Fr.) To look upon, be attentive, to have a *Guard* upon or over.

Re-WARD. (Eng.) To Re-*Gard* —Look upon, or attend to the services of another.

GUERDON. (Old Eng.) A *Re-Ward*.

WARISON. (Old Eng.) A *Reward*.

LET us mark the explanatory term WATCH, which means, To have WARD over any thing. WATCH might have been written WAURTCH even in our mode of speaking it, under which form we should not have sought for any other origin.—The term WATCH brings us at once to WAKE. The Etymologists refer us under WATCH, to the German *Wacht*, vigiliæ, the German *Wächter*, and the Belgic *Wachter*, Excubitor—the German *Wachten*, Custodire, Cavere, &c., the Saxon *Wacian*, To *Wake*, *Wæccian*, or *Wæcan*, To *Waken*, Excitare, the German *Wachen*, and the Belgic *Waecken*, Vigilare.—The German WACHE or WACHT is justly explained by my Lexicographer "The GUARD, WATCH, or WARD;" and WACH*en*, "To WAKE, WATCH, be AWAKE, be not asleep," and "To WATCH and WARD, keep WATCH and WARD." The adjacent term to these words in the German Lexicons is WACK*sen*, "To

"To WAX, burnish, grow up, increase," which belongs, as we shall instantly agree, to the EARTH, from another idea. The WATCH, the little Clock, is that which WATCHES — Preserves — *Keeps* or Measures Time, as we express it. Let us mark the explanatory word adopted in the above explanations, *Vigilo*, and we shall own, that the *Vig*, or, as it might have been, according to our pronunciation, *Vidge*, will remind us of WATCH. In the Welsh Dialect of the Celtic, *Vigilo* is *Guilied*, according to Lhuydd, and the *Gil* in *Vigilo* may belong to this Celtic term; or the L may be the termination denoting person, as in *Vigil*, and hence *Vigilo*. In Saxon, VACOL is VIGIL. In the name *Virgilius* we have the *R* in *Virg*, as in the more regular form of the Element, such as we find it in VERGE, WARD, &c. &c. The Etymologists, under WAKE, WAKEN, have referred us to the terms produced above, under WATCH, and likewise to the Gothic *Wakan*, To *Wake*, to which they might have added *Wakjan*, To *Waken*, the Swedish *Waka*, the Runic *Uaca*, the Danish *Vaage*, the German *Wecken*, to which belongs *Erwecken*, &c. Lye has derived these words from Αχεω, "Doleo, Ægre fero; quòd mo- "lestissima sit et languorem ægritudinemque corpori pariter atque "animo inducat insomnia." I shall consider, in a future work, various words under the form WG, &c., as belonging to the Element BD, PD, to the *Boden*, (Germ.) *Pedon*, (Πεδον); and some of these terms would arrange themselves with sufficient precision under the words belonging to that Element. We may observe however, that these Elements, though forming distinct classes of words, may perhaps be considered as originally connected with each other; and a difficulty occurs in our arrangement, when we are deciding on the links of the chain, by which they are united. — I shall now return to the consideration of WARD, where we see the more regular form of the Element.

We have seen, among the parallel terms to *Ward*, the German WARTen,

WARTen, which signifies " To expect, tarry, stay, stand, wait " or attend," where the idea annexed to WARD or *Watch over* passes into the sense of *Watching* or Attending to the motions of another, as *Waiting* for his arrival, &c. Let us note our term WAIT, which we see is only another form of WARTen. In our sense of the word WAIT, as To WAIT upon a person at table—to WAIT or attend upon a sick person, the word more particularly expresses its original sense of WATCHING over or *Attending* to the concerns of another. The Germans use WARTEN in the same sense, " To Tend, attend or nurse a sick person, to *Look after* " him, take care of him," as my Lexicographer explains it, who interprets WARTer by " A WARDen, *Keeper*, or Tender." The Etymologists refer WAIT to the German and Belgic *Wachten*, opperiri, vigilare, &c. and to the French *Guet*, Excubiæ, and *Guetter*, *Guatare*, (Fr. Ital.) Observare. The term WAIT, we see, belongs more directly to WARTen; and GUET, GUETer, GUATare, (Fr. and Ital.) belong to GUARD, WATCH, &c. In French, GUÊTRE signifies Spatterdashes, which means the things put over the Stockings—as GUETS—GUARDS or protection from the dirt. From hence our word GAITERS is derived. Hence GUEUX signifies a *Beggar*, from GUETer—*Waiting* or *Watching* about a House, or other Spot, to obtain Alms. Thus in the famous old Song of the Beggars, " Sometimes we WAIT at a gentleman's " gate," &c. &c. The WAITS, or Musicians, may either be derived, as Lye observes, from WAIT, because they attend upon Magistrates and others, in processions, &c.; or from WATCH and its parallel terms, because they go about the streets during the night, as the WATCH. It is difficult to decide, to which of these two ideas the term belongs.—Junius, under the word WAIT, refers us to the Belgic use of *Wachten*, and the Scotch *Waucht*, corresponding with our word *Pledge*, as when one drinks to another, and the second person answers in Dutch " *Ik* WACHT *se*,"

I WAIT

I WAIT—Stay or attend your pleasure, to do the same thing to you. He introduces likewise, on this occasion, the well-known story of Vortigern and Rowena, from Geoffry of Monmouth, in a manner which is calculated to mislead his reader. The speech of Rowena, who first addresses Vortigern, is quoted thus: "Lauerd King, *Wacht heil;*" to which Vortigern answers, as he is instructed, "Drinc heil." The form of *Wacht* might lead us to suppose, that Junius intended to refer it to the terms *Wachten* and *Waucht;* whereas, we see, it is the introductory speech, in which the Saxon word is used, and the reply, in which the Belgic is adopted. The term *Wacht* is better written *Wæs,* as it commonly is, *Wæs Heil,* Sis salvus; and it belongs to our English *Was,* signifying To *Be.* Hence, as they all acknowledge, *Wassail* is derived, a term relating to *Festivity.* Perhaps *Wastel*-Bread is *Wassail*-Bread—the Bread used at Feasts. The adjacent word to *Guéter,* in the French Vocabularies, is *Guichet,* a *Wicket,* as my Lexicographer explains it. These words, GUICHET and WICKET, mean, as we perceive, that which is put up for a GUARD—WARD or WATCH. We perceive, moreover, that GATE is the GUARD. The succeeding word to *Guichet,* in the French Dictionaries, is *Guide,* the *Guide,* or Director, which we now likewise understand to be the GUARD over another. I shall not in this place enlarge my catalogue of words, which relate to this idea under the form of the Element GRD, GD; I shall restrain myself to those only, which more particularly belong to GUARD, WARD, as the *Secured* Spot.

If we should be told, that words relating to *Sight* or *Vision* were oftentimes derived from the idea of the *Secured* Spot, we should perhaps, on the first statement of this remark, consider the observation as altogether remote from truth and probability. We should admit however, that if such be the fact, and if the operation of Sight can be derived from the *Secured Spot,* which,

as

as we shall all agree, is most directly connected with the EARTH; there is nothing, which we might not conceive to be taken from this same object—the EARTH. However remote the two ideas of Sight and the GUARD*ed* Place may appear from each other, we shall own, when we begin to reflect on the subject, that nothing is more familiar to our knowledge than this union of ideas; and perhaps we have already discovered, that *Re*-GARD is one of our most ordinary terms for *Seeing* or *Beholding*. To GUARD or WATCH over any thing brings us directly, as we now understand, to the operation of *Sight*—the most important agent in the process of GUARD*ing*. The Latin *Tueor* has the same union of ideas: it signifies "To see or behold, to look stedfastly;—To "defend, assist, or protect;" which means precisely To GUARD and *re*-GARD. Let us mark the explanatory term *be-Hold*, where we see the same metaphor from the *Hold*, the place of Security, &c. The term *Re*-GARD belongs, as we know, to the French *Re*-GARDER, the Italian *Ri*-GUARDARE, &c. &c. We shall now understand, that *Re*-WARD, the Retribution, has precisely the same meaning as *re*-GARD; and that 'To *re*-WARD a Service' means only to *re*-GARD a Service—Look back upon it—To look upon a Service after it is performed. The same metaphor is used, when a person solicits for retribution: "I hope, Sir, you will "*Look upon* me for this job—*Consider* me for this job." The Etymologists cannot avoid seeing, that *Re*-WARD belongs to *Re* and *Weard*, Versus, Erga; and then to *Re*-WARD a person would mean, if I might so express it, To *To*-WARD a person, or To Turn *To*-WARD a person. I differ only from this, by supposing, that WARD, in *Re*-WARD, does not immediately belong to the idea of Situation or Place, but that of *Attention* or *re*-GARD. We perceive, that the simple idea of To *Look to*—*Attend to*—*Consider*, will express the sentiment without the addition of the *Re* or Back again. Hence, perhaps, we have the old

word *Guerdon*, which may mean simply *Garder*, To look upon, or attend to. It is GUERDon in French, and *Guiderdone* in Italian. Skinner observes, that Menage derives the French *Guerdon* from the German *Werdung*, Pretii æstimatio; and he adds, that the Italian *Guiderdone* might be taken from *Guidare*, Ducere, and *Dono*, Lat. Donum, Præmium conductionis. Junius produces, amongst the terms parallel to *Guerdon*, the Spanish *Galardon*; and if this should be the case, my derivation is ill founded. We have *Guerdon* perhaps under another form in our ancient word WARISon, a term of the same meaning. Skinner refers *Warison* to the French *Guérison*, a Recovery, from *Guérir*. If WARISON should belong to *Guérison*, the term may perhaps signify *Recompence*, under the idea of *Refreshment*, as *Meat* and *Drink* given for some service performed. — I find however considerable difficulty respecting the origin of these words. Perhaps our Sirname *Kerrison* may belong to *Guérison*. We all remember that GUERDON is used in Skakspeare; and we forget not, likewise, how much it exceeds in value *Remuneration*. "There's thy "GUERDON," says Biron to Costard. "Go."— *Cost.* "GUERDON! "O sweet GUERDON! Better than *Remuneration;* eleven-pence "farthing better: Most sweet GUERDON! — I will do it, Sir, in "print. — GUERDON — *Remuneration*." WARISON perpetually occurs in our ancient writers. We may remember it, perhaps, in the well-known Poem of *The Battle of Otterbourne*:

"Wherfore schote, archars, for my sake,
"And let scharpe arowes flee:
"Mynstrells, playe up for your WARYSON,
"And well quyt it schall be." (PERCY's *Reliques*, Vol. I. p. 29.)

WARYSH is the next word in N. Bailey to *Warison*, which he explains by "To Cure, Heal, Save, or Deliver," and which brings us to WARD, To make Safe. In the same column of his Dictionary we have WARECTum, "Fallow Land, which has been "long untilled," where we are brought to the Spot supposed in my hypothesis. The preceding term, in Skinner, to *Warison* is

*Warish*ed, (see his third Index,) which he explains by "Eased, "Delivered;" and he derives it from the French *Guérir*, and the Italian *Guerire*, Sanare. He adds, however, that WARISH signifies *To Drive away;* and this he refers to the Saxon *Werigean*, Lacessere. He derives likewise the French *Guérir* from the German *Wåhren*, Defendere, Armare; "Qui enim morbum curat, "hominem à morbo tuetur, et ipsum contra morbum armat et "munit." If *Guérir* belongs to *Wåhren*, it must be referred to the race of words now under discussion, To *Ware*, *be-Ware*, &c., To WARD off, Keep off, or Drive off any evil. It probably however is attached to *Curo*. *Warish*, in the sense of *To Drive away*, and the Saxon *Werigean*, must be considered on another occasion.

WARD or WARK *of a City*.
Farringdon-WARD.
South-WARK.
WARDS *of a Prison—Hospital—Lock*, &c. Certain *Parts—Places* distinguished or WARD-*ed* off, as it were, from each other.
East-WARD—*To*-WARD. The certain *Place—Spot* or EARTH.
WAIRTH, WEARD, UUERT, UORDA, WAERD, WERDTS. (Goth. Sax. Al. Run. Belg. Swed.) To-*Ward*.
v-ERSUS — *h*-ORSUM — ERGA. (Lat.) To-*Wards*.
ERGO. (Lat.) What is done for a person's sake—*Erga* aliquem, or To-*Wards* any one.
v-ERGO. (Lat.) To *v*-ERGE or Tend to any *Spot*—Place, &c.
ARDWY—ARDAL. (Welsh.) A Region.
ARDWYAW. (Welsh.) To protect, defend.
AIRD. (Gal. and Ir.) A Coast, Quarter, Cardinal Point.
AIRDE *Tuath*—AIRDE *Deas*, &c. (Gal. and Ir.) North, South, &c.
ART. (Scotch.) Plaga, ora, clima.
ORT. (Germ.) Place, Part.
ORTS. (Eng.) Parts, Pieces.
n-ORTH, *sou*-TH, *ea*-ST, *w*-EST. (Eng.) The certain *Part*—Place or Quarter.
ARCTOS. (Gr.) The *North*.
EUROS. (Gr.) The East Wind.
EOS. (Gr.) The *East*, Morning.

WARD, as we have seen, the term of *Security*, is derived from the idea of the EARTH, or *the Place;* that is, if I may so express it, the Place, made a distinct and peculiar Spot of EARTH or Ground, by fences, &c., for the purposes of *Safety* and *Security*. In another sense of the word WARD, 'Urbis regio,' as Farringdon WARD; it means a Place or Spot of EARTH, under a certain jurisdiction; and it partakes in some measure of the sense of WARD, as the WARD*ed* or Enclosed Spot. Hence WARD signifies any *Place*—as divided and distinguished from another; or, in other words, the Divisions or certain Portions of any District—Building—Machine, &c., as the WARDS of a Forest—of an Hospital—Prison—Lock, &c. WARK may be considered as another form of this word: If it be supposed to signify a Rampart or Fortification, as in Bull-WARK, it has the same meaning of the Enclosed EARTH. The Etymologists derive WARK from WORK, Opus; and if that should be the fact, it is still taken from the EARTH, though under somewhat of a different idea. I shall shew in a future page, that WORK—ERG*on*, (Εργον,) is the Operation relating to the EARTH; and hence Operation in general. WAKE means a certain portion or Space near a Ship, distinguished from the water about it, as the *Place* of the Ship; where we have *Wark*, when the *r* has disappeared.—WARD, in such phrases as *East*-WARD, *For*-WARD, *To*-WARD, means simply the ORT—the Place—the EARTH, without any idea of the *Enclosure* of Safety and Security. Skinner refers WARD, Urbis Regio, to WARD, Custodia, "quia sc. quælibet urbis regio "proprias sibi Excubias et proprios Vigiles habet." The word in this sense is not noticed by Junius; but WARD, in the sense of *East*-WARD, *West*-WARD, &c., he refers to the Gothic *Wairth*, the Saxon *Weard*, the German *Uuert*, the Runic *Uorda*, the Belgic *Waerd*, to which Lye adds the Swedish *Werdts*. Skinner places WARD in this sense in a separate article, and refers us to the Saxon

Saxon *Weard*, though he adds, "Si à Lat. *Vertere* deflecterem, "quid sceleris esset?"

From the compound *Towards*, 'Going to a *Place*,' we have the idea of 'Going to—*Inclining* to any thing in general;' and hence the adjective *Toward—Towardly*, as a Boy, &c., which signifies a Boy inclining to his business—ready to do his business, Tractable, Adroit, &c. So apparently remote are words from their original idea in their mode of application; and yet so natural is the process, by which they pass from one sense to another.—*Auk*-WARD we know is the opposite to this, where *Auk* means *From—Not*, or something of that sort—'Not going 'to the WARD or Place, or from the WARD or Place—Not 'Inclined to any Pursuit—Business, &c.' The exact meaning of *Auk* is not perfectly evident. The *A* or *Au* may be simply privative, and the K may have been added to avoid the union of so many vowels. Skinner produces "*Æwerd*, Perversus, aversus," where the Æ is privative. The AUK however may belong to *Ex*, *Out*, *Aus* (Germ.), &c. &c. In *Froward*, the *Fro* has the same sense as in *To* and *Fro*, i. e. *To* and *From*. In Saxon it is *Fram*-WEARD or *From*-WEARD. While I am examining *Aukward* in Skinner's Dictionary, I cast my eyes upon the term *Award*, which is not directly taken, as he thinks, from A and *Weard*, "Versus, Erga, q. d. Erga talem (i. e.) tali addicere, assignare;" but, as Spelman conceives, it belongs to the French *Garder*, or to WARD, the term of Security, &c. To *Award* means To Assign, or settle any thing, in an authentic formal manner, so as to make the matter WARD-*ed*, GUARD-*ed*, or *Secured*.

We have seen the interpretation of WEARD by "Versus, "Erga;" and WARD the Etymologists explain in Latin, as they must do, by *Versus*. Junius likewise justly interprets *For*-WARD and *Back*-WARD by *Antrorsum*, *Retrorsum*. Yet the Etymologists have not seen that the *v*-ERS—the ERG—and the ORS, in *v*-ERS*us*,

v-ERS*us*, ERG*a*, *Antr*-ORS-*um*, and *Retr*-ORS-*um*, are only different forms of *w*-ARD, or a term of that nature, and denote the *Place* or ORT on the EARTH, ERS, ERK, &c. &c. The Etymologists derive VERS*us* from VERTO; and whatever may be the precise idea, by which VERTO is connected with the EARTH, we shall agree, that a term bearing such a sense would be naturally derived from that object. The Etymologists themselves bring us to this spot, as they agree that *Versus*—the *Verse*, is derived from the "Turning again at a *Land's* end in ploughing." Thus we see, that the name for the highest effort of the human mind, the lofty *Verse* or *v*-ERSE, is acknowledged to have been derived from the most ordinary operation performed upon the Surface of the EARTH. This will open to our view a wider scene of reflexion; and will incline us to suppose, that from the same source may be likewise derived other terms, which appear to bear a sense equally remote. The Latin *v*-ERT*o*, however, seems to be connected with this spot, under the idea of To EARTH up,—to disturb or *Turn* up the EARTH, as we express it in the labours of Agriculture, ploughing, &c. Thus, then, the word is used in its original notion, and brought to its primitive spot in the sense of "To *Dig*, or cast up," as Robert Ainsworth expresses it, "Quo sidere *Terram* VERTERE conveniat."

The Latin *h*-ORS-*um* is supposed to be derived from *Huc Versum*, as *Prorsum* from *Pro* and VERS*um*. We have likewise other compounds of this word, as *Qu*-ORS*um* from *Quo* and ORS*um*, &c. &c., and we have seen similar compounds of WARD, as *For*-WARD, *To*-WARD, &c. The Latin *v*-ERS*us*, *To-Ward*, seems assuredly to belong immediately to *Verto, Versum;* yet, when we compare *v*-ERS*us* with HORS*um*—ERG*a* and WARD, we might be inclined to think, perhaps, that they all belong to each other. We see, moreover, that VERGO, To Tend, coincides with the sense of VERSUS. When similar ideas occur in the same object,

object, they cannot easily be separated. If *v*-ERGO in its original sense meant precisely To EARTH, we see at once a cause for the signification 'To Tend to the EARTH'—"VERGIT ad *imum*," and To EARTH, as relating to Place, that is, To WARD, if I may so express it, To lie or be situated *To*-WARD any *Part* or *Quarter*—VERGIT ad orientem, 'It is *East*-WARD.'—The Latin ERGA is derived by the Etymologists from ERGO, which they consider to be quasi Εργω, the dative case of Εργον. We now see, that ERGO, "For, because, for one's sake," is directly taken from ERGA, *To*-WARDS. Such phrases as "Divina bonitas ERGA Homines," might be expressed with a similar meaning by "Divina bonitas "Hominum ERGO apparens—existens, monstrata," &c. A Kindness shewed *To*-WARDS a person is a Kindness exhibited *For* him—*Because* of him or *For his sake*, Propter eum—Ejus ERGO. The Italian VERSO means "Towards, Against—In behalf of, "With regard to," which contains the senses of ERGA "Towards, "Against," and ERGO "For, because, for one's sake."

In Welsh, ARD*wy* and ARD*al* signify 'a Region,' and ARD*wyaw*, "To protect, Defend," where we have the double sense of *w*-ARD, the Region, as in To-*w*-ARD, and of Defence, as in "*w*-ARD off." AIRDE precisely answers to *w*-ARD, *East*-*w*-ARD, &c. in other Dialects of the Celtic. Mr. Shaw, in his Galic and Irish Dictionary, produces AIRDE-*Tuath*, AIRDE-*Deas*, AIRDE-*Near*, AIRDE-*Niar*, as the terms for *North*, *South*, *East*, *West*. Mr. Shaw, under AIRD, explains it by "A coast, quarter, cardinal "point." Lye produces this Irish word, as a parallel term to ART, which in Gawin Douglas, as he says, signifies "Plaga, ora, clima." These words, we perceive, coincide with the German ORT, a Place, or Part; and to this, as I have before observed, we must refer our word ORTS, Parts, Pieces, Fragments, which was taken from the idea of *Parts* or *Pieces* of *Land*. In Mr. Shaw's Galic and Irish Dictionary we have ORDA, "A Piece, Fragment," which belongs

belongs to these words. The preceding term to this is ORD, A Hammer, Mallet, which is derived, I imagine, from the idea of beating any thing into *Pieces* or Fragments. When the *r* is lost in the Element ^*r*T, ^*r*D, denoting *Place*, we have the form ^T, ^D, bearing the same meaning. Hence, in Mr. Shaw's Dictionary, we have "AIT, AITE, a Place, Stead," and IATH, Land. It appears to me, that in our terms *no*-^RTH, *sou*-^TH, *ea*-ST, *w*-EST, the ^RS, ^ST at first simply denoted *Part* or WARD, AIT; and that the *n*—*s*, and the distinguishing vowel-sounds, were acquired in process of time to mark the difference of the Quarters. We might imagine, that the *n* and *s* were never significant, as belonging to other words, but that they were added to distinguish one from the other, and arose from vowel breathings. It is precisely the same artifice in the formation of Languages, as it relates to the vowel breathing, which I am unfolding in every part of this discussion. It is from hence that EARTH has become ORT, ART, AERDE, *w*-ARD, &c., and has been applied to denote different ideas, and to distinguish between different objects, though agreeing in some fundamental notion. I must observe, however, that the vowel breathing does not often pass into the sound of N; though we ought still to remember, that it perpetually passes into the sound of *G*, and that the *N* is a familiar organical addition to the *G*. Hence it is, that the Hebrew letter ע *Gnain* has been formed, which is by some called OIN. These names have been given to the letter, because some conceive, that it has simply the sound of a vowel breathing, while others think, that it has the sound of *GN*. We accordingly find, that the corresponding terms to the Hebrew words, beginning with this letter, commence in other Languages, sometimes with a vowel breathing, and sometimes with *Gn*, *G*, and *N*. I must add however here, what I shall suggest in another place, that the *N* and *S*, in *North* and *South*, may possibly represent articular prefixes,

prefixes, denoting *This* or *That.* We shall all readily admit, that the names for the four quarters would be naturally derived from the idea of *Place — Region — Part — Quarter.* In Arabic, the *South* is unequivocally expressed by a word, which means A certain Part—Quarter &c.; and it is often joined with its parallel word, denoting Quarter, appearing under a minute difference of form. Thus, جنوب JENUB means, "The South, "South wind. JUNUB: Sides, Parts, Tracts, &c."; جنب *Jenb*, "1. A Side. 2. A Part, a Tract of Country, a Coast;" and جنب جنوب *Jenb Junub*, means The *South* Part.

These terms for the four quarters are to be found in various Languages. *North* occurs in the Saxon *North*, the Islandic *Nordur*, the German and French *Nord*, the Belgic *Noord*, the Danish *Norden*, the Italian and Spanish *Norte*, &c., as the Etymologists understand. Lye informs us, that, according to Martinius, the *Nordwind* is derived from *Nehren*, Alere, pascere, as Βορεας is taken απο της βορας, à cibo vel pabulo, for a reason which Vossius, as he observes, unfolds to us under *Boreas.* In Vossius, Boreas is derived from Βορα, Cibus, "quoniam eo abun-"dant boreales tractus, ut censet Porphyrius; vel quòd vento "hoc flante avidiores ac edaciores simus; vel quòd," &c. &c. After such reasons for the origin of words, no attempts in Etymological conjecture can be considered as wild and visionary. General Vallancey observes, that "the Celtic name of a point of "the compass is ARD or ART, a word still used in Ireland and "Scotland. The *North* by pre-eminence was called *An Ard*, the "highest point; hence *Nard, Nord, North. Ce* is the Earth, "and *Ce*-ART or *Che*-ART literally signifies the delineation of "a nautical survey, disposed according to the proper bearings," and from this he derives "*Cart*, or *Chart.*" (See Essay on the Celtic Language, annexed to the Irish Grammar, p. 108.) The word CHART belongs to the Element CRT, denoting likewise the

the *Earth*, which I shall consider in a separate Volume. General Vallancey has recorded in an adjacent page (110), among the Celtic names for the *Earth*, the terms *Criadh* and *Creat*, to which *Chart*, *Charta*, *Card*, *Chartes*, (Χαρτης,) belong. The *An Ard*, *North*, might lead us to think that the *N* in *North* was derived from the Celtic *An*. SOUTH is found in the Saxon *Suth*, the German, French, and Italian *Sud*, the Belgic *Suyd*, the Swedish *Soder*, and the Islandic *Sudur*, &c. Some derive these from Τετιος, Pluviosus, as they derive the Latin *Auster*, 'ab *Hauriendis* 'aquis,' and *Notus* απο της Νοτιδος. The parallel terms to EAST are the Saxon *East*, *Eost*, the German *Ost*, the Belgic *Oest*, the Danish *Oster*, and the Islandic *Austur*, which the Etymologists derive from the Greek Ηως or Εως, Aurora, Oriens. The Greek Eos (Εως) may perhaps denote the EAST. WEST is to be found in various Languages, as in the Saxon, German, and Belgic *West*, the French *Ouest*, the Danish and Islandic *Vester*, the Swedish *Wester*, which the Etymologists derive from the Greek *Esperios*, (Εσπεριος,) by changing π P into τ T. The origin of *Esperos* (Εσπερος) or *Hesperus* is very obscure: The *P* may be only an organical addition to the *S;* so that *Esperos* may be ESÉR-*os* or *Ester-os*, belonging to *Vester*, &c.; or the *E* may be an addition, and the word may be *Speros*, belonging to the Element SPR.

In the Greek ARKTOS, (Αρκτος, Ursus, Ursa; Signum cœleste; Piscis quidam;—*Pars orbis Septentrionalis*,) we see unequivocally the form of AIRDE, as in AIRDE-*Tuath;* and we shall now understand, why in our Dictionaries ARKTOS, (Αρκτος,) originally meaning the certain EARTH—ORT, Place or Part, is adjacent to ARK*eo* (Αρκεω, perpulso) and ARK*us*, (Αρκυς, Rete,) which belong to ERKOS, (Ερκος, Septum,) the *Enclosure*—from the peculiar—Separate EARTH. Every thing, we see, in Language is consistent and uniform. We shall now moreover understand, why the Stars towards the

North Pole have been connected with the idea of a *Bear*. This has arisen from a confusion in the meaning of words, where ARKTOS (Αρκτος, Ursus, Pars orbis Septentrionalis,) means at once a *Bear* and the *North*. — Heraclitus, as it should seem, understood by ARKTOS, (Αρκτος,) the Horizon; in which case it actually denotes the ORT — AIRDE, the place — quarter — or EARTH, under the notion of the ERKOS, (Ερκος,) the Boundary — Place — or EARTH. The idea of the *Boundary* is perpetually connecting itself with these words, and cannot, in many cases, be separated from their original meaning. "Heraclitus," says Martinius, sub voce *Arctos*, "(ut ad Manilium notat Scaliger,) nomine Αρκτον intelligit ipsum "Horizontem." The Greek ORIZO and OROS, (Οριζω, Termino, Ορος, Terminus,) and the HORIZON, may directly belong to this race of words — to ERKOS, (Ερκος,) &c. The Greek EUROS, (Ευρος, ventus ab oriente spirans, &c.) EURUS, must probably be referred to the terms now under discussion; where we have the full form ^RS, ^RD. The Latin *Auster* should perhaps likewise be added to this race; and we perceive, that it more particularly coincides in form with *Oster*, *Austur*, and *Wester*, &c. above produced, as terms for other quarters. *Euros*, (Ευρος,) is supposed to be derived from "απο της εω ῥεοντα, quod flatus ejus ab oriente sit hiemali," or from "ευ ῥειν, bene fluere." The Greek *Notos*, (Νοτος, Notus, Auster,) may be derived from *Notis*, (Νοτις, Humor,) as it is imagined, though it may have been formed as *North*, and applied to a different quarter. The succeeding word to *Euros*, (Ευρος,) referring to a quarter of the EARTH, in the Greek Dictionaries, is EUROS, (Ευρος, latitudo,) Breadth; and we shall all agree, that EUROS, and EURUS, (Ευρος, Latitudo, Ευρυς, Latus,) denoting Breadth or Extension, would be naturally derived from the EARTH. While examining the Greek EURUS, (Ευρυς,) I find in the same column of my Greek Vocabulary by Hederic, EUROOS, (Ευρως, Sitis, mucor, caries,) *Dirt*, *Filth*, which, we should likewise all agree,

agree, would be most naturally taken from the *Dirt* of the EARTH. —We have seen, that in Celtic, IATH means Land; and in the same column of Mr. Shaw's Galic Dictionary, where *Iath* occurs, we have *Iarthar*, the West, belonging to *Iar*, which means at once "The West," and "After, At, Upon." Whether *Iar* should be considered, as having lost the Radical *T*, quasi *Iart*, and as belonging to our Element ^RT, I cannot decide. Again, we have *Oirthear*, "The East, Eastern World;" and in the same column, "OIRTHIR, the shore, coast, borders." Among other terms for the East, Mr. Shaw gives us *Oirsceart*. We shall see in a future page, that *Air* and *Oir* are Celtic terms for the West and East, and this will supply us with a topic of reflexion, which opens into a wide field of investigation.

Enclosures in general, for any kind and for any purpose, as of *Defence*, *Holding*, &c., originally derived from the appropriate EARTH, &c.

Words signifying that which *Enfolds*, *Keeps in* or *off*; *Stops*, *Represses*, *Compresses*, *Constrains*.—Words denoting what is *Held*, or *Confined* within a certain Spot, &c.

Bull-WARK, *Boule*-VART or *Boule*-VERT, *Balo*-ARDO, *Bal*-VARTE, *Boll*-WERCK, *Bull*-VERCK. (Eng. Fr. Ital. Span. Germ. & Belg. Dan.)

ERKOS. (Gr.) An Enclosure.

EIRGO, EIRKSO. (Gr.) To Include—Keep off.

ARCEO. (Lat.) To Keep off.

ARX, ARC-*is*. (Lat.) A Citadel.

ARSENAL, ARCENAL, ARSENALE. (Eng. Fr. Ital.)

ARKEO. (Gr.) To Keep off—To be of Assistance to—To be adequate to, or sufficient for any occasion or purpose.

AREGO. (Gr.) To Defend or Assist.

ERUKO — ERETUO. (Gr.) To Keep in—Inclose—Repress.

ARKUS. (Gr.) A Net.

ARCTO — ARCTUS — ARTO — ARTIO. (Lat.) To Keep in—Hold fast, Compress, &c. Tie tight together, &c.

ARTUS. (Lat.) The Limbs, quod Membra Membris *Artentur*.

ARTHRON, ARTICULUS. (Gr.) Joints, from the idea of Confining — Tying or Keeping together.

ARTE, ARTEN. (Old Eng.) Cogere, Compellere, *Arctare*.

ARCA. (Lat.) A Chest, Coffer, &c.

ARK. (Eng.) A Chest, Boat, Ship.

ARK-*Wright*. (Eng.) A Sirname.

ARGO. (Gr. Lat. &c.) The famous *Ark* or Ship of the *Argonauts*.

ARCH, ARC, EARC—EARK, ARK, ARCHE, ARCA, ARCK. (Welsh, Galic, Sax. Germ. Fr. Ital. and Span. Dan.) An *Ark*.

ARC*us*. (Lat.) The Bow, and ARCH. (Eng.)

ARC — ARCO. (Fr. Ital. and Span.) An *Arch*, &c.

IRIS, IRID*is*. (Gr.) The *Arcus*, or Rain-*Bow*.

URCEUS — ORCA. (Lat.) Names of Vessels.

AURKS. (Goth.) *Urceus*.

ORCUS. (Lat.) The Enclosure confining the Dead.

ORKOS. (Gr.) The Confining or Binding Oath.

ORKANE. (Gr.) An Enclosure, Net, &c.

ORCH-*eomai*. (Gr.) To Dance—to perform a Circular *Round-about* Motion, as within an *Enclosure*.

HORD — HOARD, HERD. (Eng.) The *Ward*, or what is collected within the Enclosure — the *Ward* — the *Guarded Earth*, or Spot.

HORD — HORDAN. (Sax.) Thesaurus, Recondere.

HERDA. (Isl.) Servare.

HERD of animals. HAIRDA, HEORD, &c. HERDE, HERD, HARDE, HIORD. (Goth. Sax. Belg. Germ. Fr. Dan.)

HERD or HERDS*man* — *Sheep*-HERD, or *Shep*-HERD, *Cow*-HERD, HARDEIS, HYRD, &c. HIRT, HYRDE. (Eng. Goth. Sax. Germ. Dan.) Pastor, Bubulcus.

CWEN-HYRDE. (Sax.) An Eunuch — the *Quean* or *Queen-Herd* — the *Herd* or Keeper of the Women.

HURD — HURDIS. (Eng.) Sirnames.

ARISTÆUS, ARGUS. (Lat.) The Shep-*Herd*, Cow-*Herd*.

AUGEAS, quasi AURGEAS. (Lat.) The Cow-*Herd*, &c.

HARAS. (Fr.) A Stud, or *Herd*.

WARD, the term of *Security* and Defence, appears under the form of WARK, and we have seen under a similar form the ORCH in ORCH-*Yard* — the Greek ERK*os*, EIRGO, and EIRXO, (Ερκος, Septum, Vallum, Ειργω, Arceo, Prohibeo, Ειργω, ξω, Includo.) ERGO and ERXO (Εργω, ξω, Arceo, veto, includo) are acknowledged to be only different forms of EIRGO, EIRXO, (Ειργω, ξω,) &c. &c. We shall now understand the origin of the WARK in *Bull*-WARK.

The

The *Bull* belongs to the Element BL, denoting the Earth; and means nearly the same as WARK, the *Enclosure* of Safety—Strength. *Bull* belongs to *Bolos*, (Βωλος, Gleba, Ager,) *Wall*, *Vallum*, &c. &c. Salmasius sees, that *Bull* has reference to *Bolos*, (Βωλος.) Skinner derives *Bullwark* from *Boll*, Globus, and *Work* or *Werck*, Opus, Fabrica, q. d. Fabrica Globosa, Sphærica; and Menage, as he says, derives it from the German *Bol*, Trabs, and the same term *Werck*, q. d. Fabrica ex Trabibus constans; "sed *Bol*," as he adds, "hoc sensu nusquam mihi occurrit." Menage has produced various other derivations for this word, which it is not necessary to record. The parallel terms to *Bulwark*, exhibited by the Etymologists, are *Boulevart*, *Boulevert*, (Fr.) *Baloardo*, (Ital.) *Balvarte*, (Span.) *Boll-Werck*, (Germ. and Belg.) *Bullverck*, (Dan.) where we see, that the WARK, WERCK, VERCK, VART, VERT, ARDO, are different forms for the EARTH, or *Secured*, Enclosed Spot of Ground.—To the Italian BALOARDO belongs the term BALORDO in that Language, signifying Stupid, Foolish, a person of a mind *impenetrably* dull, against which no impressions of good sense can prevail, as in the following metaphorical application of the same kind. Hamlet, as we remember, says to his Mother,—

"Peace; sit you down,
"And let me wring your heart; for so I shall,
"If it be made of *penetrable* Stuff;
"If damned custom have not braz'd it so,
"That it be proof and BULWARK against sense."

Junius remarks under the word *Sconce*, that in Islandic VIRKE is *Vallum*, and that in Saxon Manuscripts he has found WERC and WEORC frequently used for *Castellum*, "i. munimentum "adversus repentinas hostium incursiones exstructum: unde "manifestum hujus acceptionis vestigium adhuc in compluribus "arcium oppidorumque nominibus remansit." Let us mark the explanatory

explanatory term ARC*ium*, and we shall then understand, that the ARC or ARX, ARC*is*, is only another form of the words before us. To this belong ARS*enal*, *Arcenal*, (Fr.) *Arsenale*, (Ital.) &c. We shall likewise remember the explanatory term of EIRGO—EIRXO, (Ειργω, Ειρξω, fut.) the Latin ARC*eo*, and we shall then see, that they all belong to each other.

The Etymologists justly remind us, under these Latin words, of the Greek ARKEO, (Αρκεω, Propulso, Auxilior, Opitulor;—Sufficio; Satis sum;—Par sum, Contentus sum, Adquiesco,) which is still another of these terms. That the idea of *Keeping off*, or Driving Back, should be derived from that of the *Secured Place*—or *Enclosed* EARTH, the ERK*os*, (Ερκος,) &c., we shall readily grant. We see, moreover, how immediately the sense of what is Adequate or *Sufficient* for any purpose, 'Par sum—*Sufficio*—Satis sum,' connects itself with the ability to *Defend* yourself against attacks—To repel attacks, or to afford assistance—'*Propulso*, *Auxilior*.' Again, the idea of *Sufficiency* or being *Satisfied* with any thing, '*Satis* Sum vel Habeo,' connects itself, under another point of view, with the notion of having *Satisfaction* or *Pleasure* in any thing—of being *Contented* with a thing, or *acquiescing in it*; and hence we shall understand, why ARK*eo*, (Αρκεω, Contentus sum, Adquiesco,) means to Be Content or Satisfied with any thing, and why an adjacent word ARESKO relates to a similar idea of *Satisfaction—Pleasure*, or *Content*; (Αρεσκω, Αρεσω, Placo, amicum reddo;—Placeo, Αρεσκομαι, Adquiesco, Placet conditio, Satis sit mihi.) We perceive, that one of these words is explained by '*Satis* sum,' and the other by '*Satis* sit;' and that they are both explained by *Adquiesco*. Thus we see, how ARESK*o* and ARES*o*, (Αρεσκω, Αρεσω,) relating to the idea of *Pleasing*, are connected more immediately with ARK*eo*, (Αρκεω,) and are ultimately to be referred to the ERK*os*, (Ερκος,) the *Enclosure*—the ARETZ—ARK—the EARTH. There is still another adjacent term, AREGO, (Αρηγω, Auxilior,

Auxilior, opem fero,) which is only a different form of ARKeo, (Αρκεω, Auxilior, opitulor.)

To AREGo and ARKeo, (Αρηγω, Αρκεω,) we must add ERUKo and ERETuo, terms of a similar meaning, (Ερυκω, Inhibeo, contineo, servo. Ερητυω, Inhibeo, cohibeo, reprimo.) They are all derived from the same idea of the ERKos, (Ερκος,) the Enclosed—Secured EARTH. A passage or two in Homer will abundantly explain the original notion of these words:

Λειπε δε λαον
Τρωϊκον, ους ακεοντας ορυκτη ταφρος ΕΡΥΚΕ.
(*Il.* Π. 368-9.)

" Deseruitque is populum
" Trojanum, quos invitos profunda fossa coercebat."

Here we see, that ERUKo, (Ερυκω,) under the idea of Stopping, is referred to the impediment caused by the *Fence* of the EARTH. We see, moreover, that the Latin term *co*-ERC-*ebat* corresponds with it in meaning, and is derived from the same spot.—Let us note another term ORUKTe, from ORUSSO or ORUTTO, (Ορυκτη, Ορυσσω, Ορυττω, Fodio,) To Dig, which we shall instantly grant is derived from the EARTH. The same word ERUKO (Ερυκω) is again applied to the *Defence* of EARTH or Ditch, raised by the Greeks, about the Ships. " What fools," says Hector, " are the " Greeks to make these weak contemptible Fortifications, which " will not Stop or repress my Might!"—" Tad' ou menos amon " ERUXEI —(ταδ' ου μενος αμον Ερυξει,)"—" which will be no ERKos, " (Ερκος,) no ARX or Bull-WARK against my fury."

Νηπιοι, οι αρα δη ταδε τειχεα μηχανοωντο,
Αξληχρ', ουδενοσωρα· ταδ' ου μενος αμον ΕΡΥΞΕΙ.
(*Il.* Θ. 178-9.)

The same column in my Greek Vocabulary, which contains ARKeo, (Αρκεω,) exhibits likewise ARKus, (Αρκυς, Rete,) a Net, which

which signifies the ERKOS, (Ερκος,) or Enclosure. ERKOS itself means an Enclosure and a Net. (Ερκος, Septum, Vallum; τα Ερκη, Retia.) I again perceive in the same column, ARKT-OS, (Αρκτος,) The Bear, which, with its corresponding term, the Latin URSUS, belongs, as we see, to our Element ^RK, ^RS. These words convey the idea expressed by HIRSUTUS, which will be explained on another occasion.

The Lexicographers have seen, that ARCTO, ARCTUS, &c. belong to ARCEO, which not only signifies to "Keep off, out or "from;—To drive away;" but "To hold fast, strain, or tie hard— "Teneras ARCEBANT vincula palmas," as Robert Ainsworth explains it.—ARTO, "Strictum facio," and ARTIO, are only different forms of ARCTO—ARCEO. The Etymologists justly consider the ARTUS, the Limbs or Joints, to be so called "quòd membra "membris ARTENTUR." Hence we have ARTICULUS, and the Greek ARTHRON, (Αρθρον.) Skinner observes, that in Old English ARTE, ARTEN, signifies, "Cogere, compellere, fort. ab *Arctando*." In Galic, ART is "A Stone, a Tent, Tabernacle, House."—ART likewise means "A Bear"—"A *Limb*"—"God"—"Flesh," which are produced by Mr. Shaw, as separate words. In the same page of Mr. Shaw's Dictionary, we have AROS, "A House, "Habitation,"—AROCH, "A Hamlet, a little shielding;" and the same writer explains ARAS by "A House, Village, Settlement." The *House* means the *Enclosure* or Appropriate Spot. The sense of the *Limb* and *Flesh* must be referred to ARTUS, and that of the Bear belongs to ARKTOS, (Αρκτος.) The name of God should probably be referred to the race of words, signifying *High*—Great—Illustrious, &c., as the Galic ARD, "High, Lofty, "eminent, excellent," which we find in the preceding page to that, in which ART occurs. In Welsh, AROS signifies "To tarry "or stay; to wait or expect; to dwell, to abide," which means to EARTH, or to be fixed in a certain Place or EARTH. The word

ARRASS, Tapistry, is supposed to be so called from the Town in which it was made, which may be the case. If this were not so, it might belong to ARAS, under the idea of the Stuff for *Enclosing—Covering*, &c.

The adjacent word to ARCEO, &c., ARCA, "a Chest, Coffer—an ARK," is acknowledged to belong to ARCERE, Continere; and ARC*anus*, Secret, they derive from ARCA. Robert Ainsworth explains one sense of ARCA by "A Dam of wood to keep away "the course of the waters; an ARK." In English, we know, ARK is used for an *Enclosure* of different kinds, a Chest, Boat, Ship, &c., as 'the ARK of Moses, the ARK of Noah.' To ARK, as denoting the *Enclosure* of a Boat or Ship, belongs the name of the celebrated Ship, ARGO. The word ARGO has been derived from *Argos* the person, who is said to have built the Ship, or the place where it was built, or because it carried *Argives* or Grecians, or from *Argos*, (Αργος,) Swift, &c. Junius produces the parallel terms to ARK, as the Welsh *Arch*, the Saxon *Earc*, *Erk*, the German *Ark*, the French *Arche*, the Italian and Spanish *Arca*, the Danish *Arck;* all which he derives from the Greek EIRGO, "Ειργω, Includo. Item Arceo." ARC is another form of the word in Saxon, and ARKA is the Gothic term. The familiarity of the term may be understood from the name, which denotes the Maker of the ARK, as ARK-*Wright*. In Welsh, ARCH, as Mr. Richards explains it, is "A Chest, a Coffer. Thus in Arm. "*Arch* Noe, Noah's ARK, a Coffin. Heb. ארגז ARGAZ, a Chest, "a box, D. It is also used for the Body, exclusive of the head, "arms, and legs, q. d. the *Chest* of the Body." Lhuyd produces under ARCA the Irish *Arg*, and *Airk*. I find in Mr. Shaw's Galic and Irish Dictionary, ARC, "A chest, ARK;" and in the next article, "ARC, a Body." Having obtained the original sense of the word, I must leave the Celtic Scholars to discover, why ARC signifies "a little Pig, a Dwarf, a Bee or Wasp, "a Lizard,

"a Lizard, Impost." Perhaps the little Pig, the Dwarf, and the Wasp are derived ab ARCTO corpore, from the *Contracted Compressed* Dimensions. The *Impost* is likewise perhaps taken from the idea of *Compression*—or Griping hard. The *Lizard* or *Lacertus* belongs, we know, to *Lacertus*, the Arms, where we have again the idea of *Compression—Hugging in.* The succeeding words in Mr. Shaw's Galic Dictionary are "ARCAN, a Cork-stopper. "ARC luachrach, An adder, lizard. ARCHU, A Chained Dog. "ARCHON, A Fierce Dog. *Archuisg*, An experiment. ARCHUR, "Sucking. ARCIS, A Hide." In the Stopper and the Chained Dog we see the true idea. The sense of Sucking is derived probably from the notion of *Compressing* or Squeezing out, and in that of the Hide we see the *Enclosure.* What the *Experiment* is derived from, I know not. Again, in Welsh, ARGAE signifies, as Mr. Richards explains it, "A Fence to keep water in its own "channel, or in mill-dams, a lock in a river, a water gate; "a place inclosed, an inclosure, a close." Here ARGAE corresponds with the sense of ARCA, given by Robert Ainsworth, of "A Dam of wood to keep away the course of the waters." In the same column of Mr. Richards' Welsh Dictionary, in which the interpretation of ARCH is, we have ARCHEN, "Clothing, apparel. "It seems to signify properly a shoe, patten, or any thing worn "on the foot:" and in the next column we have ARCHRE, "Cloaths." These words are probably taken from the idea of that which *Incloses*, &c. The Latin *Arcera*, a species of Rustic Cart, may belong to ARCA, though it may be derived, as some think, from *Carrus.* The *Acerra*, the Incense Pot, might be quasi *Arcerra*, and belong to *Arca.*

We shall now understand, that ARC*us*, the ARCH and the *Bow*, is the Round *Enclosure.* The Latin Etymologists have a similar idea, when they refer ARC*us* to ARK*eo*, (Ἀρκεω,) Teneo. The term occurs in the French *Arc*, and the Italian and Spanish *Arco.*

Arco. Junius faintly observes on these words in the modern Languages, ARCH, &c., " Videntur esse desumpta ex Lat. *Arcus;*" and he adds, " Alii derivant ab Αρκειν, Propulsare, continere, " auxiliari; quod universam concamerati operis molem, jamjam " veluti casuram, lapides mutuo sibi incumbentes atque invicem " obstantes sustineant." Skinner observes on ARCH, " Hoc " nimis manifeste à Lat. Arcus, quia *Arcum* flexum figurâ refert." IRIS, IRID-*os*, *is*, (Ιρις, Ιριδος) is the ARC*us*, the ARCH, Bow, or *Bend.* The Etymologists derive *Iris* from *Eiro*, Ειρω, Denuncio, " quod presentem pluviam et futuram denunciet serenitatem," says Martinius. URC*eus*, the Pitcher, and ORCA, " vas teres ad " vinum, oleum, salsamenta capienda," another species of vessel, signify the *Enclosure.* In Gothic, AURKS is URC*eus*, as Lye explains it. ORC*us*, the place of confinement for the Dead, and then the Deity of the Dead, is an ERK*os*, (Ερκος,) or *Enclosure* of a different kind, and brings us to the Spot, from which I suppose these terms to be derived. Some justly remind us of this Greek word under ORC*us;* and by others we are referred to the Greek ORCH*os*, Ορχος, Fovea, the Ditch—to the Chaldee name for the EARTH ארקא ARKA, and to ORK*os*, Ορκος, the Oath, because the Gods swear by Styx, and the Infernal Regions.—The fable of Swearing by the Infernal regions is probably a mistake, arising from a confusion in the terms ORC*us*, the Place of the Dead, and ORK*os*, the Oath. The word was sometimes written in the ancient Language of the Latins, HORC*us* and URAG*us.*—The term ORK*os*, (Ορκος, Jusjurandum, Juramentum, Sacramentum, fœdus, religio,) as applied to the solemn Oath—League, &c., denotes the Ceremony or Rite of *Security* or *Assurance*, and belongs to the race of words before us, denoting the ERK*os*, (Ερκος,) the *Secured* or *Safe* Spot; that is, ERK*os* (Ερκος) is the locus, qui *Securos* homines facit,—and ORK*os* is the Ritus, qui *Securos* homines facit; or ERK*os* is the *Septum* materiale—

and

and ORKos the *Septum* mentis. This origin, for terms denoting an Oath, is obvious and simple; and such, we know, has perpetually been the metaphor annexed to this subject. The term ORK*ane*, (Ορκανη,) under a similar form, in its first part, to ORK*os*, (Ορκος,) the Oath, actually signifies the same as ERK*os*, (Ερκος,) and is derived by the Lexicographers from that source; (Ορκανη, Septum, Sepes, Sagena, ab Ερκος.) ORK*ismos*, (Ορκισμος,) is explained by "*Obstrictio* per Jusjurandum," the *Binding*—by an Oath, where we have a similar metaphor. There is however another possible origin of this word, which will be explained in a future page.

While I am employed in examining these words, I cast my eyes upon the Greek ORC*heomai*, ORC*heo*, (Ορχεομαι, Salto, Tripudio, Ορχεω, Moveo, Saltare facio,) To Dance. Here again we are brought to the idea of the ERK*os*, (Ερκος,) the *Enclosure*—as the Place fenced *all round*, as we term it, or to the *Round-about*, if I may so express it. The action of *Dancing* is often connected with the idea of Going *Round*—or of a *Circular* kind of Motion. Lye has compared our term *Dance* with the Greek *Donesis*, (Δονησις, Agitatio,) or, as he might more accurately have said, *Dinesis*, (Δινησις, In vorticem, seu gyrum circumactio,) Κουροι δ' ΟΡΧΗΣΤΗΡΕΣ ΕΔΙΝΕΟΝ, &c. *Il.* Σ. 494.; and he has interpreted the former word, as if he had employed both terms in his derivation, "Volutatio, vacillatio, agitatio, talis præsertim, qualem "in choreis videmus, quum aut *gyri* fiunt saltatorii, aut pro "modulorum ratione passus variantur." The Greek CHOR*os*, (Χορος, Chorus,) has a similar idea of a *Round-about*, and belongs to the explanatory Latin term just quoted, *Gyr*us. An adjacent word to ORC*heomai*, (Ορχεομαι,) To Dance, is ORC*his*, Ορχις, *Testiculus*,—Genus olivæ, which appears to contain an idea very remote from that of Dancing. The resemblance however will be readily acknowledged. The sense of a *Round-about* or *Circum-*

ference

ference not only belongs to the idea of a flat Surface, but is extended to Bodies of a solid form; and it is then applied to solid substances of a *Round*-about appearance (if I may so say), or of a *Swelling* out form. Hence Orchis, (Ορχις,) denotes the *Testiculus* and the Olive. The Latin *Am* and the Greek *Amphi*, (Αμφι,) relate, we know, to the *Round* or Circumference; and from hence, as we know likewise, are derived *Ampulla*—*Amplus*, &c. Again, I find adjacent to Orkos, (Ορκος,) the Greek Orizo, Oros, (Οριζω, Termino, Finio, Ορος, Terminus, Limes, Finis alicujus regionis, vel agri, Ορος, Mons, collis,) the Separating *Enclosure* of Lands—the Fence—the Boundary—the Bounding Hill, &c. The idea of the *Boundary* of *Land* would of all others, as we might suppose, supply terms, which would be derived from the Earth. Let us mark the word Terminus, which I have shewn to be attached to the TMN, the Ground. This likewise we should have supposed *à priori;* but let us mark another word derived from it, *Term*, and note what office it is made to perform by a metaphorical application. This will shew us, how words belonging to the Ground may express ideas, which apparently are far removed from the original notion. There is however one difficulty respecting *Orizo* and *Oros*, (Οριζω, Ορος,) which it is necessary to explain. These words are all certainly attached to an Element denoting the *Ground;* but whether they belong to our Element ^RZ, ^RS, or to that of ^R, is not absolutely manifest. The *Izo* and the *Os* in these words may be only additions from the construction of the Greek Language. In Hebrew, the name for a Mountain, which seems to correspond with *Oros*, (Ορος, Mons,) belongs to the Element ^R. In Hebrew הרה HRH or הר HR signifies "A Mountain, a protuberance, rising, or Elevation of "the Earth."

From the idea of the certain Place or Earth—the appropriate Spot, Guarded or Warded off from the rest, for the purpose

purpose of Security and Defence, we pass at once to the notion of whatever is Secured or comprehended within that Spot or Place; and hence we have HORD—HOARD—HERD. The HORD of Barbarians, Robbers, &c. is the company of Barbarians—Robbers, &c. living in a certain EARTH or Place—distinguished and separated from others. This brings us nearest to the original idea; and we see, how HORD in this sense connects itself with EARD*ian*, Habitare, Incolere. The HORD or HOARD of Goods—Treasure, and the HERD of cattle, denote the things or animals deposited or collected within the WARD, or GUARD*ed* EARTH or *Spot*. The Etymologists refer HORD to the Saxon HORD, Thesaurus, HORD*an*, Recondere, and the Gothic HAURDAI, Ostium; and Lye produces the Islandic HIRDA, Servare, custodire. To HOARD up is to collect together in the WARD or Repository. In Saxon, HORDER is *Custodia*, and *Boc*-HORD is Bibliotheca—the Repository for Books. In the prose compositions, communicated by Chatterton to Mr. Barrett, as the productions of Rowley, this term for a Library frequently occurs. "Inne the middest of thys cloyster bee the *Boc*-HORDE, wyth "fulle mainte bookes thereyn," &c. &c. (The Rolle of Seyncte Bartholemeweis Priorie in Barrett's History of Bristol.) HERD, or HEARD, the company or HORD of animals, the Etymologists have referred to the Gothic *Hairda*, the Saxon *Hiord*, *Heord*, *Hired*, the Belgic *Her*, *Herde*, the German *Herd*, *Herde*, the French *Harde*, the Danish *Hiord*, &c. We know, that HERD is sometimes used for the HERDS*man*, or the Man attending on the HERD; and to this belong the parallel terms in other Languages, produced by the Etymologists, as *Hairdeis*, (Goth.) Pastor, the Saxon *Hyrd*, *Hyrde*, the German *Hirt*, the Danish *Hyrde*, &c. &c. Junius has justly remarked, that the original sense of this word is that of *Custos;* and hence, as he says, the Saxon *Cwen*-HYRDE, "Eunuchus, cui demandata est mulierum Custodia." *Cwen*-

HYRDE

HYRDE is literally the *Queen*-HERD, the Woman-WARD, or WARD*er*. I have shewn, that *Queen*, the illustrious Woman, and *Quean*, the low or bad Woman, belong to *Cwen*, and to the Greek GUN*e*, (Γυνη.) Lye explains the Saxon HYRD by Pastor, Custos; and HYRD*an*, by Custodire, Servare. The HERD, as applied to the collection of Animals and to the Man, means precisely the WARD*ed*, and the WARD*er*. We have various combinations of this word, as we know, in our Language, as *Shep*-HERD, or *Sheep*-HERD, *Cow*-HERD, the WARD*er* or Keeper of Sheep or Cows. In *Herdsman* it seems as if HERD meant the Flock, and the *s* might be added under that idea; but it was probably at first the HERD-Man, or Keeping-Man. Junius has derived HURDLE, the Fence of osiers, &c. from HYRD*an*, Custodire; but whether this be the fact must be considered in a future page. HURDLE is found in the Saxon *Hyrdel*, the Belgic *Horde*, *Hurde*, the German *Hurde*, as produced by our Etymologists. My Lexicographer explains the German HÛRTE or HÛRDE by "a HURDLE, "HORD, Pen, fold, grate." In the next column of my Dictionary I find HORT, "a Protector, strong-hold, safety, refuge." Junius only produces under HURDLE the derivation of Meric Casaubon from Κορδυλη, "quicquid eminet et convolutum est." The preceding term in this Lexicographer is HURD, which, as he observes, in Gawin Douglas is *Thesaurus*. Lye properly refers it to HORD, Thesaurus.—To this race of words belong our Sirnames HURD, HURD*is*, &c. Skinner observes under *Hurdle*, that it has some relation to the Greek EIRGO, (Ειργω, Claudo.)

The term succeeding the Saxon HEORD, HERD, Grex, is HEORD*an*, HEORD*as*, which Lye explains by "HARDS, Stupæ.—"It. Napthæ, fomites." HEORD*an*, with its parallel term HARDS, seems directly to belong to the HEORD, the HERD, the collection of things *crowded together*, and to mean *Stupæ*—the coarse materials, which are used for calking Ships, &c., by being

Crammed

Crammed close together. *Stupæ*, (Lat.) *Stupe*, (Στυπη,) are derived from *Stupho*, (Στυφω, Adstringo;—Spisso, Denso,) under a similar idea of *Stuffing*, or Cramming together. The word HEORD*an* signifies *Napthæ*, *Fomites*, from the inflammable property of *Tow*, or *Flax*. In the same column of Lye's Saxon Dictionary we have HEORD*nesse*, Custodia, and HEOROD, "i. q. HEORD," says this Lexicographer, "Conventus Monachorum," a HERD of Monks. The succeeding word is HEOROT, or HEORT, Cervus, which may be derived from the idea of these animals going together in HERDS. The contrast between the wounded solitary Deer—"the poor sequester'd Stag," in its rejected—unnatural state, and of the HERD, sweeping by him in a body, has supplied, we know, to our great Bard, an affecting topic of Poetical imagery.

"Anon a careless HERD,
"Full of the pasture, jumps along by him,
"And never stays to greet him."

If this be not the origin of the word *Hart*, it may perhaps be taken from HARD or HARSH, and refer to the blows given by the Horns of this animal. Junius imagines, that it is derived from the HEART, because timid animals have large HEARTS. The parallel terms to HART occur in various Languages, as in the Saxon *Heort*, above produced, the German *Hirsch*, the Belgic *Hert*, the Danish *Hiort*, &c., which the Etymologists understand.

We find adjacent to the words HYRD, Custos, and HYRD*an*, Custodire, in Lye's Dictionary, the term HYRED, or HIRED, which signifies "*Familia*;—*Palatium*;—Curia;—Exercitus;—Conventus "Monachorum," as Lye explains it; which signifies the HERD or *Company* belonging to a certain EARTH, as a Family, a Convent of Monks, and afterwards a *Company* in general, as an Army, &c. It likewise means the appropriate spot or EARTH, in which persons are collected together, as a Palace, Court of

Justice, &c. &c. In Old English, HIREDE perpetually occurs for a *Family—Houshold*, &c. I shall only add the Gothic HARJ*is*, which signifies, says Lye, "Multitudo, Legio."

To the idea conveyed by HIRED, Palatium, we should perhaps refer the Saxon HEARGE, HEARCH, Templum, Fanum. The succeeding terms in Lye's Dictionary to HEARGE, Templum, is HEARGE, Hercules, which might belong to the idea of the HERD, the Governor—or to our Element ^RG, signifying, To HARROW, *Harrie*, HERG*ian*, (Sax.) To Rout, Depopulari, Hostiliter invadere, which will be explained on another occasion.—Skinner refers to HYRED, HEORD, Familia, our old word HEORD-*feste*, which is the same as *Hust-fastene*, Pater familiâs. In French, HARDE not only signifies a *Herd*, but in the plural HARDES, it means "Attire, clothes, dress, Houshold goods," which signifies the HERD—HOARD or *collection* of other things; and hence is derived the verb HARD*er*, To exchange, or truck, as the HARDES, or Goods. Again in French, HARAS means "A Stock of Breeding mares, Stud.—The place where a stud is "kept," that is, the HERD, or collection. Skinner, in an Appendix, has YERD, which he says is interpreted Government, and which he derives from HEORD, Pastor, Grex, or from YARD, (Gird. Sax.), the Rod, "Virga enim et fasces Imperii vera insignia sunt." YIRD means what is subject to the HERD—the WARD*er*. The preceding term in Skinner is YERD, Rod, for YARD, which I have shewn to mean a measure of EARTH or Land. We sometimes find the idea annexed to HERD, the company of animals, without the *R*, as in *Ede—Eowde*, (Sax.) Grex. In the column of Lye's Saxon Dictionary, where the latter word occurs, I find again the form ^RD, as EORYD, Legio; and in the preceding page we have EOROD, "Cohors, turma," &c., which is adjacent to the source, from whence these ideas are derived, EORTH, the EARTH. I shall not attempt to produce the various corresponding words in Saxon,

Saxon, &c. denoting a HERD, or Company, as EORED, Legio, WEORAD, Cœtus, agmen, &c. &c.

We shall now understand, that the "Pastor ARISTæus" is the HERD or Keeper of Cattle, and that ARGus, the Keeper of *Io*, the Heifer, is likewise nothing but the HERD. The quality of possessing many Eyes, attributed to ARGus, would be naturally connected with the vigilance of a HERD or Keeper of Cattle; yet I suspect, that the story of his many *Eyes* has arisen from a confusion in names, and that ARGus under this idea belongs to the Greek AUGE, (Αυγη, Lux; — Oculus,) the English EYE, and its parallels *Eag*, (Sax.) *Ooghe*, (Belg.) AUG, (Germ.) the Oc in the Latin *Oculus*, the Italian *Occhio*, the French *Yeux*, &c. In the Greek *en*-ARGes, (Εναργης, clarus, evidens,) we have the form ^RG. I shall shew, that the English *Heed* — the German *Hüten*, &c. &c. &c. belong to HERD, the *Keeper*, and HYRDan, To Keep; and perhaps *Auge*, (Αυγη,) Oculus, AUGazo, (Αυγαζω, video,) EYE, &c. may belong to HEED, &c. &c., To observe, behold, WATCH, &c. &c. In Mr. Shaw's Galic Dictionary we have AIRGE, A Herd; and that this is taken from the idea of *Confinement*, will be manifest from the succeeding term "AIRGHean, "a Bridle, Rein;" and it means likewise "Symptoms, AIRGHEANNA "*a bhais*, Symptoms of Death," that is, when the Chains of Death Encompass you. In another place of Mr. Shaw's Dictionary we have ARGairim, "To Keep, HERD." The form of these terms brings us directly to ARGus. I shall consider in another place the words, with which these Celtic terms are accompanied. We know that ARGus was the HERD or Keeper of *Io*. In the word *Io*, a confusion of names has likewise arisen. *Io* is quasi *Jo*, the *Cow*, which is to be found in a great variety of Languages; as *Cu*, (Sax.) *Ho*, (Dan.) *Huhe*, (Germ.) &c. &c., which the Etymologists have produced; and we may add to these the Persian گاو *Ga-oo*, and a corresponding term in Sanscrit. In the Hindoo Mythology

of

of the seven Heavens, the Seas are supposed to consist, among other things, of " *Ghee*, a species of liquid butter," that is, of the produce of the *Cow*. (See Mr. Gericke's Introductory Remarks to Mr. Kindersley's Specimens of Hindoo Literature.)—Aug*eas*, the possessor of the numerous Oxen, and of the Aug*ean* Stable, which Hercules cleansed, is the Herd, or Arg-*us*. An adjacent word to the Saxon Herd is Here, Exercitus, Turma, Cohors, which may perhaps be quasi Hereg, and belong to the race of words now before us. There is however some difficulty, as to the precise idea, from which Here in this case might be derived. The Saxon Herge, Hergh, actually signifies *Turma*, but it means likewise *Prædatores*, which connects it with the adjacent word Herg*ian*, To *Harrow*; and this belongs to the Earth under another idea. We see in *Harrow*, that the *G* has been lost. The German Herr, a Lord or Master, with its parallel terms in other Languages, may be perhaps quasi Herrig. In Hersc*hen*, to " Govern, rule," we perhaps see the genuine form; and the term probably means to Possess a certain Earth or Land. *Herschaft* signifies the command over a certain Land or District, ' the Dominion, Lordship, Domination, Seignory,' &c., as my Lexicographer expresses it. If this should be the case, the Latin *Herus* must be added to the race of words, which are now under discussion. The term Her-*us* might be referred to the Element FR, VR, denoting Man, as Vir, (Lat.) In Irish, Fear is " A Man, a Husband," as Mr. Shaw explains it. In the next article I shall suggest another idea; from all which the Reader will perceive, that the term is of very doubtful origin. There are few words, in which I have found it necessary to propose such various derivations.

HÆRES, HÆRED-*is*, ERES. (Lat.) The Person who is to possess the *Earth* or Land.

Heir, *Hoyr*, *Hoir*—HERETIER, HEREDE, HEREDERO. (Eng. Belg. Fr. Ital. Span.)

HERSCHEN. (Germ.) To Rule, Govern.

In-HERIT. (Eng.) To Possess, Dwell in.

WARIS. (Pers.) A Heir.

IRAS—IRS. (Arab.) *Inheriting*, *Inheritance*.

IRS. (Heb.) To *Inherit*.

BEFORE I conclude my observations on the race of words, belonging to the form of our Element ^RS, &c., which denote the *Appropriate* or *Peculiar* Spot of Ground or EARTH, as distinguished from others, I might here introduce a term, which unequivocally brings us to this idea; and which will afford a striking illustration of the truth of my Hypothesis. We shall all at once agree, that the Latin HÆRES, HÆRED-*is*, or as it was anciently written ERES, is the person, who possesses, or is destined to possess, the Certain Spot of *Land*—or of EARTH, HERTHA, HERDA, &c. On this point, I imagine, no one can doubt.—In the English word *Heir*, the last consonant of the Radical is lost, as it is in the French *Hoir*, and the Belgic *Hoyr*, &c.; but it is preserved in the French *Héritier*, the Italian *Herede*, the Spanish *Heredero*, and the English *In-Herit*. Some derive *Hæres* from *Hæreo*, "quod, qui *Hæres* est, *Hæret*, hoc est, proximus est ei, "cujus *Hæres* est." Festus observes, that HÆRES anciently signified *Dominus*, HÆRES apud "antiquos pro *Domino* ponebatur." Some refer *Hæres* to the Latin *Herus*, and the German and Belgic *Herr*, *Heer*. If these words belong to each other, the *S* has been lost in *Herr* and *Heer*, and perhaps in *Herus*; as the *Us* must be considered probably as a termination only. In the German HERSchen,

HERSchen, To govern, rule, &c., we see the last consonant preserved. Angelus Caninius justly produces as parallel to HÆRES, the Hebrew ירש IRS, " quod est, HÆREDEM esse, Pos-" sidere." Mr. Parkhurst explains this Hebrew word by " To " *Inherit*, be Heir;" and he is aware that all these terms belong to each other. In the Chaldee and Syriac, IRT has a similar meaning. Festus defines HÆREDium by ' *Prædium* parvulum,' where we are at once brought to the EARTH.—The metaphors of the Poet will supply the most important information in the study of Languages; since they are precisely of the same kind as those, from which Languages have been originally formed. The Reader may perhaps recollect, that in a passage of Shakspeare the same imagery is connected with the same word, and exhibited exactly as I have stated it in my Etymology of HÆRES. Capulet, in Romeo and Juliet, wishing to express, that his daughter Juliet is the sole HEIRESS of his fortune, says,

" She is the hopeful Lady of my EARTH."

On which Mr. Steevens observes, " This is a Gallicism: *Fille* " *de terre* is the French phrase for an HEIRESS. King Richard " calls his land, i. e. his kingdom, his EARTH:

" Feed not thy sovereign's foe, my gentle EARTH.

" Again,

" So weeping, smiling, greet I thee, my EARTH.

" EARTH in old Plays is likewise put for *Lands*, i. e. Landed estate. " So in *A Trick to catch the Old One*, 1619:

" A rich widow, four hundred a year in good EARTH."

In-HERIT is used by Shakspeare for *Possess* or Dwell on a Place, as the Saxon EARDian is, which means " Habitare, Incolere."

" The great globe itself,
" Yea, all which it *In*-HERIT, shall dissolve."

Mr. Malone

Mr. Malone explains it by "All who possess, who dwell upon it. "So in the *Two Gentlemen of Verona:*

"This, or else nothing, will INHERIT her."

In Persian, وارث WARIS is a *Heir*, which is only another form of HÆRES. In Arabic likewise, ايراث IRAS is "Making one an "*Heir.* — *Inheriting*," says Mr. Richardson. Again, in the same Language, ارث IRS is "*Inheritance, Heritage, Hereditary* Right;" and in another sense it signifies *Ashes*, where we are at once brought to the dirt of the EARTH. We have likewise another sense, where it means "Wounded, mortally *Hurt;*" and in HURT we see a parallel term. In Mr. Shaw's Galic and Irish Dictionary we find OIDHRE, and OIGHRE, denoting "An *Heir, Heiress.*" There is still another sense of the Arabic IRS, ارث "A Root, "stability, firmness, the principal part, any thing agreeable to "ancient *Hereditary* Custom," where in the sense of a *Root*, *Stability*, &c. we are brought likewise to the EARTH, under the idea of the *Base* or Foundation. The succeeding word in Mr. Richardson's Dictionary is the Persian ارثه URS*et*, "A Limit, "march, boundary, confine, order;" and the next word is the Persian ارج ERJ, "Price, *Worth*, value, esteem, honour," where let us note the explanatory term WORTH, which I have referred to the EARTH, as the great source of *Value*, *Property*, &c.

CHAP. I.

SECT. II.

^C, ^D, ^G, &c. &c.

Terms, which signify the Appropriate *or* Peculiar *Spot of* EARTH—ARK, *&c. &c., or* EARTH—ARK, *&c.*—Secured *by the* Fence *or* Enclosure: *Hence, Terms denoting* Possession—Security—Caution—Attention:—Enclosures *for the purpose of* Covering—Holding, *&c. &c.*

ECHO. (Gr.) To Have or Possess a Peculiar or Appropriate Spot of *Land;*—sometimes under the idea of an *Inclosure;*—To Inhabit, &c.

AIGAN—AGAN—ÆGAN—ÆGNIAN. (Goth. and Sax.) To Hold—Have—Possess.

ÆGN. (Sax.) Proprius—*Own.*

HEDGE—HEGGE, &c. HAEGE—HECKE, &c. (Eng. Sax. Belg. Germ. &c.)

HAY. (Eng.) Rete Cuniculare: —the *Enclosure.*

HAIE—HAIER. (Eng. Fr.) The *Hedge,* To Enclose.

HAW-*Thorn.* (Eng.) The *Hedge* Thorn.

HAWS. (Eng.) The Berries on the *Hedges.*

HAW-HAW. (Eng.) The sunk *Hedge* or Fence.

HAGA, HAGEN. (Sax.) } Agellus,
HAY-HAW. } Prædium, Domus, Mansio.

HAGE—HAWCHIS. (Isl. Scotch,) Enclosed Pastures, or Meadows.

HAY—HIEG, &c. (Eng. Sax. &c.) Gramen: the product of those Meadows, or Fields.

To dance the HAY. (Eng.) To Dance Round or in a *Ring;* as it were about a *Ring-Fence.*

HAYES—HEYS—HAWES, &c. &c. (Eng. Names.)

HAY-*Ward*—HOWARD. (Eng. Names.) The Keeper of the *Hedge,* or Fence; or of what is included within the *Hedge* or Fence.

AGROS

AGROS—AGER—ACKER—ACRE—ACERE, &c. (Gr. Lat. Germ. and Belg. Sax. &c.)

HAITHJO—ÆTHER. (Goth. Sax.) Ager.

ACHADH. (Gal.) A Field.

UATH. (Gal.) The Earth.

IATH. (Gal.) Land.

IATHAM. (Gal.) To Surround.

AIT, AITE. (Gal.) A Place, Stead.

HUTCH — HWÆCCA — HUCHE, &c. &c. (Eng. Sax. Fr.) The Enclosing vessel.

HAT, HÆT, HOED, &c. (Eng. Sax. Belg.) What Encloses the Head.

HOOD—HOD, &c. (Eng. Sax.) Capitium.

HUT, HUTTE, HYDDA. (Eng. Sax. Germ. Belg. Island.) The *Hedged* in, or Enclosed Place.

HEED—HEDAN—HUTEN. (Eng. Sax. Germ.) To *Watch*, or Keep, as within a *Hedge* or Fence.

HUT. (Germ.) *Heed.*

HUSH—HIST. (Eng.) To HEED, Listen, be silent.

OTHE. (Gr.) HEED.

AUDIO — AUSCULTO — AKOUO. (Lat. Gr.) To *Heed*, or Hear.

OUS — AUD*in*, AZ*in*, &c. (Gr. Chald. Heb.) The Ear.

HARK — HARKEN, HYRCNIAN, HORCHEN. (Eng. Sax. Germ.)

AUSES — AUDES, *Aures*, *Ear*, *Eare*, *Ohr*, ORECCHIA, OREJA, &c. &c. (Lat. Eng. Sax. Ger. Ital. Span. &c.)

HAUSGAN, *Hear*, *Hyran*, *Horen*, &c. (Goth. Eng. Sax. Germ. &c.)

HUSH. (Pers.) Care, Attention.

HUSHT*iden*. (Pers.) To preserve, Keep.

HIDE — HYDAN, HOEDEN, &c. (Eng. Sax. Belg.) To Conceal, i. e. To Enclose.

HIDE, HYD, HOUDE, HAUT, &c. (Eng. Sax. Belgic, Germ.) The Skin, the Enclosing Covering.

HIDE. (Eng.) A Portion of Land.

IN the present Section I shall consider certain words, belonging to the form of our Element ^C, ^D, ^G, &c., when the sound of *r* has been lost; which denote the *Appropriate* and *Peculiar* Spot

of EARTH, *Secured* by the *Fence* or *Enclosure;* and hence *Security* — *Caution* — *Attention*, as HEDGE, HEED, &c. Some of these words coincide altogether in sense with the terms before produced, as ERKOS, (Ερκος,) &c., which, when the *r* is lost, becomes *Ekos*, &c. &c. I shall introduce into the present article those words, which denote *Holding* or *Possessing*, under the idea, as I conceive, of *Holding* or *Possessing* a certain Spot of EARTH or Land, as the Greek ECHO, (Εχω,) &c. &c. — There are some terms, belonging to this form of our Element, which, though they signify to *Hold* — *Take in*, &c., are derived, as I imagine, from another train of ideas, and which therefore will be considered in a different portion of my Work. I shall introduce however in this Section the consideration of some terms, which present themselves in the course of my discussion; though they are not directly connected with the train of ideas above unfolded.

The original sense of the Greek ECHO, (Εχω, Habeo, Possideo, Teneo, Obtineo; — Cohibeo, Reprimo, Cingo, Circumdo; — Habito, Incolo,) is that, as I imagine, of *Holding* or *Possessing* a certain Peculiar or Appropriate Spot of *Land* or EARTH, ARK, A*r*K, &c. &c., sometimes under the idea of an *Enclosure*, or ERK*os*, E*r*K*os*, (Ερκος,) &c. &c. When it refers to an *Enclosure*, we have the sense of *Cingo*, *Circumdo;* and we unequivocally, I think, see the idea, from which this Sense of *Holding* is taken, when it signifies To *Hold* or *Possess* a certain Spot of *Land*, or To Inhabit a certain Spot of Land, *Habito*, Incolo. I shall shew, that *Colo* belongs to *Solum* for the same reason. In Gothic, AIG*an* signifies Habere, and in Saxon, AG*an*, Æ*Gan*, Æ*Gnian*, Possidere. The preceding word to Æ*Gnian*, Possidere, is ÆGN, Proprius, to which, as the Etymologists understand, belongs the English *Own*. The parallel terms to *Own*, produced by the Etymologists, are the Gothic *Aigin*, *Aihn*, the Saxon *Agen*, the German *Eigen*, the Danish *Egen*, &c. These words will be more particularly considered in a future page.

Our

Our familiar term HEDGE presents itself most conspicuously among those words, which denote a *Fence—Enclosure*, &c. The Etymologists produce the parallel terms, which are to be found in other Languages, as the Saxon *Hegge*, *Hæg*, *Hedor*, the Belgic *Haege*, the German *Hag*, *Hâge*, *Hecke*, Sepes, *Hegian*, *Hagan*, (Sax. Germ.) Sepire, &c. &c. Skinner observes on this word, "Parum quid alludit G. Ερκος, septum, claustrum." Junius records the Latin names, explained by Spelman, *Haga*, *Haja*, and Lye justly refers us to the word *Hay*, Rete cunicularium, where the sound of *G* is lost in *Y*. Skinner has a HEY-*Net*, which he justly compares with HEGE, Sepes. We have seen, that ERKOS, (Ερκος, Septum, vallum; τα Ερκη, Retia,) means both an *Enclosure* and a *Net*. Junius refers us to the French *Haier*, Sepire, which is quasi HA*jer*. Thus *Haie*, the *Hedge*, is quasi *Haje*.—The Etymologists understand, that *Haw*-Thorn is the HÆG-*Thorn* or HEDGE-*Thorn*; and hence HAW, in Hips and HAWS, Morum Sentis. The preceding and succeeding terms in Junius to *Haw*, Morum Sentis, are HAW and HAWCHIS. He explains HAW by "Cantianis vocatur agellus domui adjacens et "*Circumseptus*, unde iis *Hemp*-HAW, item *Bean*-HAW dictus est "talis agellus, cannabis vel fabarum sationi destinatus. D. HAWE "est Hortus. Olim quoque *Mansum* vel *Villam* sic videntur "appellâsse. v. Spelm. Arch. in HAGA. Argent. codici *Heiwafrauja* "exponitur οικοδεσποτης. Marc. XIV. 14." HAWCHIS is explained by Lye, "Prata, &c. G. Dougl. Isl. HAGE est locus pascuus." Lye in his Saxon Dictionary explains HAGA, HAGEN, by "*Hay*, "*Haw*, Agellus, Prædium, Domus, Mansio." From the HAGE, the Locus pascuus, comes HIG, (Saxon,) "Fœnum, *Gramen*," to which our word HAY belongs. The Etymologists produce the parallel words to *Hay* in other Languages, as the Saxon *Hieg*, *Hig*, the Gothic *Hawi*, the Belgic *Hey*, &c., the Cimbric *Hei*, the Danish *Hoe*, the German *Hew*, or *Heu*, &c. "To Dance

"the

" the *Hay*—Dancer à la HAYE," Skinner rightly explains by " In orbem ac figuram *Sepis* Choreas ducere." The idea of the *Ring*-Fence, or the Fence all *Around*, brings us directly to that of Dancing in a *Round* or *Ring;* and this serves to confirm my idea, that ORC*heomai*, (Ορχεομαι, Salto,) to Dance, is derived from the ERK*os*, (Ερκος,) the Sur-*Rounding* Fence.—The HAW-HAW, we shall now understand, is that, which serves for a *Haw* or HEDGE. From the terms denoting the HEDGE, thus doubled HAW-HAW, we have the Sirname HEY-HOE. The HAW in the eyes Skinner rightly derives from the *Haw* or HEDGE, HÆG, *Sepes*, &c. &c., " quia sc. visum intercipit, intercludit, et quasi " *intersepit.*"

From these words HAY, HEDGE, the *Fence*, are derived our familiar names, HAY, HAYES, HEYES, HEYS, HAWES—HAWIS—HOWES—HIGGS, &c. &c. Skinner produces the word HAWGH or HOWGH in his Index of proper names, as a " Nomen Gent.," and observes, that Camden explains it by " Parvum pratum in " valle situm."—The name HAY-*Ward* means likewise, as some Etymologists understand, the *Keeper* of the HAY—HEDGE or *Enclosure*. Others derive this word from *Heard*, Grex, or *Hig*, Gramen, and *Ward*. The sense of HAY-*Ward* comprehends in it the idea of Keeping the property, whatever it may be, within the HAY or HEDGE. The illustrious name of HOWARD may either convey this notion, or it may be derived from HOF and *Ward*, the Keeper of the Court. HOF however, in its original sense, means the ordinary Court-Yard, and in a secondary sense, the Court or Precincts of a King's Palace. My German Lexicographer explains HOF in one of its senses by " The Yard, Court-Yard—*it.* A Croft, HAW." Some might imagine, in order to preserve the dignity of the name, that HOWARD was formed from the HOF, as denoting the Court of a Prince. Skinner, who produces various other derivations of this

this proper name, observes, "Heroico nomini injurius viderer, "si deflecterem ab ant. *Haward* seu *Haiward.*" Such ideas however are idle and futile; and Skinner has justly observed, "Et tamen omnibus notum est, etiam summas gentes à rebus "vilissimis, ut Agricultura Pisis, imo etiam Galbis ortum duxisse." Perhaps *Hayward* and *Howard* may be the same. The succeeding term to *Howard* in Skinner is *Howburn*, which he derives from *Hæg*, or *Haga*, Agellus, and *Bourn;* for the sense of which latter word he refers us to his general Dictionary, where we find the explanation of *Torrens*. *Bourn* means probably in this place *Boundary*, and the whole word means the *Boundary* of the HEDGE or Enclosure.

The Saxon HAGA, HAGEN, Agellus, will direct us to that portion AG of the Latin explanatory term, AG*ellus*, which coincides with it, to its primitive AG*er*, and corresponding term in Greek AG*ros*, (Αγρος.) The Etymologists derive these words from Αγω, "Quòd in eo multa sunt *Agenda*, ait Donatus. "*Actiones* ad vitam alendam præcipue sunt ruri," says Martinius: To these terms the English ACR*e* belongs, with the parallel terms *Acere*, &c. (Sax.) *Acker*, (Belg. and Germ.) &c. &c. Martinius produces, moreover, the Hebrew אכר AKR, Agricola, which he derives from כר KR, Campus. This may create some difficulty, as the Element CR denotes likewise the *Ground;* and from hence might *Ager*, &c. be derived. I have given however, as I imagine, the original idea. The parallel word produced by Castell, under the Hebrew term אכר AKR, is the Arabic اكر AKR, "Digging, Delving." The Latin AGGER means AGER, either under the idea of the *Separate — Enclosed Land* or Field, Secured by the Mound; or the *Earth'd* up Place, the Place Secured by the Mound of *Earth*. Some derive AGGER, the Heap, from *Aggero*. The name for a *Field*, belonging to our Element, appears in Gothic and Saxon under various forms, as AKRS, (Goth.) *Ager*, HAITHJO, (Goth.)

Ager,

Ager, *Acer*, *Æcer*, *Æcr*, *Æcyr*, *Æther*, (Sax.) Ager. We find adjacent to the Gothic *Akrs*, another Gothic term, *Akran*, Fructus, which means probably the production of the *Akrs*, or Field.—Under *Æcer* we have the compounds Æcer-*Ceorl*, Agricola, Colonus, and *Æcer-Mon*, Agricola, in German *Acker-Mann*, which expressed in their parallel terms mean *Acre-Churl*, *Acre-Man*. To the latter word belongs our Sirname *Ackerman*, to which we must add *Hackman*, *Hickman*, &c. &c. The Greek Agra, and Agr*euo*, (Αγρα, Captura, Venatio, Αγρευω, Venor,) belong to Agr*os*, (Αγρος,) and mean that, which is Taken or Hunted in the *Field*. My Lexicographer considers *Agra*, (Αγρα,) as a Root. The adjacent term Agr-*Upneo*, (Αγρυπνεω, Vigilo,) seems to come from Agr*euo* and *Upnos*, (Αγρευω, Υπνος,) under the idea of *Chasing* away Sleep. The compound is supposed to be that of A priv. and Υπνος, and the *Gr*, γρ, is imagined to be an addition *Per Epenthesin*. The Greek Egeir*o*, (Εγειρω, Excito,) and Ageir*o*, (Αγειρω, Colligo,) may possibly be other forms of Agr*euo*, (Αγρευω.) I have proposed however a different idea in another place.

The Etymologists derive Agora, (Αγορα, Forum rerum venalium,) from *Ageiro*, (Αγειρω,) which is a very probable conjecture; yet Agor*a*, (Αγορα,) seems to be derived directly from Agr*os*, (Αγρος,) the *Field* or Place, by way of distinction, as destined for a peculiar purpose. Agur*is*, and Agur*eo*, (Αγυρις, Cœtus, multitudo congregata, Αγυρεω, Congrego, Colligo in unum,) must be referred directly to *Ageiro*, (Αγειρω,) and yet in *Aguris*, and Agur*tes*, (Αγυρις, Αγυρτης, Qui congregat ac cogit in unum, Circulator, et Præstigiator *Circumforaneus*,) we seem to perceive more immediately the Crowd of the Agora, (Αγορα.) The Greek *Egregoreo*, (Εγρηγορεω, Vigilo,) or Egr—Egor-*eo*, is a reduplication of the same Element, whatever it be, GR, or ^G, ^GR, signifying to *Stir up*—*Excite*. It belongs to Egeir*o*, (Εγειρω,) and perhaps to *Agreuo*, (Αγρευω.) From the form *Gregoreo*, (Γρηγορεω,) we have the

the name *Gregory*. While I am examining *Gregoreo*, (Γρηγορεω,) I cast my eyes on *Gureuo*, (Γυρευω, In orbem verso; Fodio,) which means To *Dig up* or Stir up the Ground; and hence we may see, that the Element GR might supply the idea of *Stirring up — Exciting, &c.* In the preceding column to *Agros*, (Αγρος,) I find in my Greek Vocabulary *Agrippos*, (Αγριππος, Oliva Sylvestris,) and *Agriphe*, (Αγριφη, Ligo bidens, rastrum.) The word *Agrippos*, (Αγριππος,) is considered as a Root, yet we plainly see, that the *Agr* in this term belongs to *Agros*, *Agr*ios, (Αγρος, Αγριος, Agrestis,) and means *Sylvestris*. In the same column of my Vocabulary we have the same term in composition, applied to the same thing; — *Agrielaios*, (Αγριελαιος, Oleaster; — Ex *Agresti* oliva, seu Oleastro confectus.) On the latter part of the compound *Agr-ippos* I cannot decide. We might have thought, that the ^P in this word belonged to the ^V in *Oliva*, if we had seen, that the Element ^V was a separate significant part. The V in *Oliva* seems to be only an organical addition to the L. On the Greek *Agriphe*, (Αγριφη, Ligo bidens, Rastrum,) I am doubtful. The *Griphe* may belong to *Grapho*, (Γραφω,) which means to *Grave*, *Grub*, or Dig up, and the *A* may be intensive; or the *Agr* in *Agr-Riphe* may be derived from *Agros*, (Αγρος,) and *Riphe* may belong to the Element RP, signifying To *Stir* up — *about*. I shall shew that *Rapto*, (Ραπτω, Suo, Consuo, Sarcino, Consarcino;—Struo, Machinor,) and *Ripto*, (Ριπτω, Jaceo,) &c. belong to the Element RP, under this idea of *Stirring*, — *Throwing*, or *Raking* up, together, about, &c. — The Greek *Choraphion* seems to be a similar compound from *Chora*, (Χωρα,) Land, and the Element RP. The former word means the Instrument Raking up the Land, and the latter, the Land *Raked* or Harrowed up, or the Land demanding that operation. The word *Choraphion*, (Χωραφιον,) occurs in the old Glossaries, and is explained by " Ager Satio- " nalis." It is supposed to be a diminutive from *Chora*, (Χωρα.)

The

The word is to be found in the Scholiast on Theocritus, who in explaining this passage, Απο σπορω ασκαλα παντα, (Idyll. X. v. 14.) observes, Σκαλευω δε το Χωραφιον, οτε σκαλισι καθαιρω αυτο, where the term is connected with the very action of *Stirring* up the Ground — *Ploughing* — *Raking* — *Harrowing*, &c., from which I suppose it to be derived. — In the Irish and Galic Dialects of the Celtic, we have "ACHADH, a Field;" and the terms adjacent to this in Mr. Shaw's Dictionary are "ACHAIDH, An Abode," and "ACHA, A Mound, or Fence." Again, IATH is Land, and IATH*am* signifies "To Surround, move round." In the same Dialects, AIT, AITE is "A Place, Stead."—UATH is "the EARTH, "Mould."

The name of the Town in Holland called the HAGUE, is supposed by Skinner to be taken from the Saxon *Hegge*, *Hæg*, and the Belgic *Haege*, Sepes, Septum, "forte," says this Lexicographer, "à nobili aliquâ olim circa villam Principis *Sepe*." The preceding term in Skinner is *Haga*, the name of a place in Surry, which he derives from *Hagan*, Mora Rubi; and the succeeding word is HAG-*Worthingham*, the name of a Town in Lincolnshire, which he derives from *Hæg*, Sepes, *Worthig*, Vicus, via, septum, agellus, and *Ham*, Habitatio. We shall find the names of various places derived from the HEDGE or Fence. — I shall not attempt to produce the various forms, under which the parallel terms to HEDGE occur in Saxon, as they will be instantly seen to belong to this race of words. — There is an Arabic term, which ought not to be omitted on this occasion. The Arabic اياد AIAD seems directly to signify the HEDGE, *Fence*, &c. It is interpreted thus by Mr. Richardson: "Whatever Preserves, "Defends, or Protects, as a Fortification, Castle, Asylum; the "bark of a tree; a veil, curtain; the hair, ether, atmosphere; "mounds of clay or Earth raised round tents, houses, or cisterns, "to keep out, or hold in water." Again, in Arabic, حد HD means "A Boundary,

"A Boundary, Limit." In the next opening of Mr. Richardson's Dictionary, I find حرد HRD, "An Impediment," and حرز HYRZ, a "Fortification, a garrison town, a castle, "a place of refuge." The preceding term, under the same form, is HYRZ, "Rough Ground," which directly brings us to the spot, supposed in my hypothesis. Here we have the form ^RD, &c.

The succeeding word to *Hedge* in Junius is HEED, relating to Care—Attention; and it is derived from the idea of *Keeping*—WATCH*ing* or *Attending* to any thing within the HEDGE or Fenced Place. We have seen under the form ^RD, HERD, the Keeper of the Cattle, and HYRD-*an*, Custodire, belonging to the *g*-UARD*ed* place, the secured YARD or EARTH. Junius properly explains HEED by "Curare, Custodire;" and the Etymologists produce the parallel terms to be found in other Languages, as the Saxon *Hedan*, the Belgic *Hoeden*, the German *Hut*, Custodia, and *Hüten*, Custodire. We find succeeding to this Saxon word HED*an*, "Cavere, Curare, Attendere," the Saxon HED-*Clath*, Ventrale, HED-*Clyfa*, Cubiculum, *Hedd-Ern*, Cellarium, granarium, &c., "*Heden*, Casla;—forsan Cassia," which I do not understand, and *Heder*, Sepes, &c. The Saxon *Eder* and *Edor* are other forms of *Heder*, and probably of *Æther*, *Ager*. The form of these terms will remind us of the Latin ATR*ium*, to which it should be referred. EDOR signifies *Domus*, as well as *Sepes*. Some derive the Latin *Atrium* from Αἰθρα, because the ATRIUM was the *pars subdialis*—others from *Ater*, &c. &c. The term ATER seems to be taken from the *Ground*, under the idea of *Dirt*—*Mud*, &c. The Etymologists derive *Ater* from *Attero*—Ἀνθραξ, Αἴθω, &c. &c. There is always a difficulty with respect to words under this form to determine, whether they belong to the Element ^T or TR. Through the whole compass of Language TR denotes the Ground—*Terra*, &c. My conjecture however about

the origin of *Heder*—*Eder* and *Edor* must be right, as they directly connect themselves with *Hedan*, Cavere, &c. Perhaps the Latin Hedera, Ivy, should be referred to these words *Heder*, &c., the Enclosure, under the idea of the Enclosing or Twining Plant. This form of words will be considered in another place. The preceding terms to *Edor* and *Eder* in Lye's Dictionary are Edo, and Ede, Grex, where we see precisely the idea of the Herd, the *g*-Uarded, or Heeded animals within the Fence. Lye refers us, under Ede, to Eowde, Grex, another form. In the same column of Lye's Saxon Dictionary, where *Eder* occurs, we have *Edisc*, which he explains by " *Edish*. Vivarium." In the sense of *Vivarium* we see the idea of the Herd—in the Preserved, secured Spot. We have likewise Edisc-Weard, Vivarii Custos, where we have two words of a similar kind, joined together. Skinner refers Edish to the Saxon *Edisc*, and his explanation is " Gramen Serotinum hoc à præp. Loquelari, A. S. *Ed*, Rursus, " Denuo, Iterum, q. d. Gramen quod denuo crescit, παλιμφυες." In some counties Edish certainly has the sense given by Skinner, and it may be derived from the Saxon *Ed*, Rursus, but it has nothing to do with *Edisc*, Vivarium. Mr. Grose in his Provincial Glossary explains Eddish by " Roughings, North. Ground " whereon wheat or other corn has grown the preceding year; " called, in Norf. and Essex, an Etch. Also, in the North, " After-grass." In the same column of Mr. Grose's Glossary we have " Ed-*Grew*, After-grass. Shropsh.," " Edder. Fence " Wood, commonly put on the top of Fences. Norf. and Essex." In the same column we have Easter, " The Back of the chimney, " or chimney-stock. North;" which perhaps means the Edder—the strong *Fence*—or Support. In the same column of Lye's Saxon Dictionary, where Edor, Sepes, Domus is, I find Edra, Vena, which may perhaps mean the *Enclosure* for the Blood—" *Sepes* Sanguinis." The corresponding term in German is *Ader*.

Another

Another form of *Edra* is *Ædra* or *Æddra*, which latter word Lye explains by "Vena; Renes; nervi, Rimæ, Fissuræ, Crenæ," where we have at once the idea of the *Hollow — Receptacle — Enclosure.* These words are adjacent to *Æcyr*, *Æcer*, *Æcr*, Ager.

HUT is explained in my German Lexicon by WACHE, WACHT, HEED, GUARD, &c.; and HUT*en* likewise means, according to the same Interpreter, "To take HEED, *beware*, Have a care, &c. &c. "Das vieh, To tend or keep the Cattle;" and HUT*er*, "A GUARD-"*ian*, WARD-*en*, Keeper," &c. HUT likewise means a HAT, the Enclosure, to preserve the Head. The Etymologists are aware of this derivation, and they produce the other parallel terms, which are found in various Languages, as the Saxon *Hæt*, *Hæsel*, the Belgic *Hoed*, the Islandic *Hattur*, the Danish *Hat*, Hyemalis mulierum pileolus. HOOD, *Hod*, (Sax.) Cucullus, Capitium, is only another form of HAT, &c.; and the Etymologists have accordingly referred it to the same source. HOOD, as in *Priest*-HOOD, &c., belongs to a different idea, which will be explained in a future page. An adjacent word to the Saxon *Hæt* in Lye's Dictionary is H*Æteron*, Vestitus, where we have a similar idea of an Enclosure or Covering to protect the person. In the German Lexicon, the adjacent word to HUT is HÜTTE, "A HUT, "Cottage," which is likewise understood to mean the secured protected place. The Etymologists coincide with this idea, and they produce likewise, as parallel terms, the Saxon and Belgic *Hutte*, and the Islandic *Hydda*. HUT will naturally suggest to us the word HOUSE, which I have produced in another part of my Work, and referred to the idea of the Appropriate *Spot — Place* or EARTH, in which a person is *Seated* or *Situated.* Nothing is so difficult as to decide on the mode of arranging a subject, when the same general idea prevails in the words which are discussed; though perhaps they may appear to be distinguished

distinguished by a turn of meaning somewhat different from each other. We perceive, I think, that HUTTE, the HUT, or Cottage, seems to be more particularly connected with terms denoting the *Fence;* that is, the Appropriate Spot, or EARTH, as *Guarded*, Fenced, &c. &c., as HEDGED in; as a spot, in which things are HEED*ed*, if I may so express it, *Watched*, &c. &c.—In Lye's Saxon and Gothic Dictionary we have the following article, "HICÆ." Paruca; Vocab. "Dewes. 'Non liquet, (inquit Somnerus) fortasse Perruqua, i. e. "galericulus.'" If it means any covering for the Head, it may perhaps be referred to these words. The succeeding word in Lye is *Hicemase*, "Parrax, Regulus, scil. avis," which I do not understand. The succeeding word to HUT in Skinner's Lexicon is HUTCH, *Arca*, which, with its parallel terms *Hwæcca*, (Sax.) *Huche*, *Hotte*, (Fr.) *Hotte*, (Germ. and Belgic,) *Hucha*, (Span.), must be referred to the same notion of the *Enclosure*, or HUT, for the purpose of Securing or preserving any thing. I have already referred the explanatory term ARCA to a similar sense under the form of our Element ^RC; and Skinner justly reminds us, under HUTCH, of ARCA or ORCA. In the German Lexicons, the adjacent word to *Hůtte* is HUTSCH*en*, "To rush along, to "move or stir, a crawling or a creeping," and "HUTS*che*, A low "wooden stool or seat," where we see the idea of the EARTH, &c. under another sense—that of the low situation, and the Spot, on which animals Move—Rush—*Crawl* or *Creep*, &c. An adjacent word to the English *Hut* is HUSK, and this Skinner refers to the Belgic *Hulsche*, &c., which he derives from *Helan*, Tegere. If *Husk* and *Hulsche* belong to each other, then *Husk* must be referred to the Element ^L, to *Helan*, *Hold*, &c. Yet Junius explains HUSK from Martinius by "*Domuncula* vel theca, i. "Involucrum tritici;" and derives it, with its diminutive *Husken*, vel *Huysken*, from the Teutonic *Hus*, vel *Huys*, Domus. There is still another adjacent word to HUT—the term HUSH. This

This word HUSH means simply to HEED. Skinner informs us, that Minshew derives this word from the Hebrew *Haschah*, Silere; though he adds, "Mallem à Teut. *Hucken*, Con- "quinescere, appressis clunibus humi desidere." Another form of HUSH is HUISTE, which is produced by Junius, as *vox silentium indicentis*, occurring in Chaucer. We have still a different form of HUSH, as HIST. Another term of Silence, WHIST, probably belongs to WHIS*per*, and to other words denoting a gentle noise. We shall now be prepared to understand, that the Latin AUD*io* and Greek AKO*uo*, (Ακουω,) mean nothing but to take HEED. The Greek OTHE, (Οθη, Cura,) should perhaps be referred to HEED, &c. Some derive AUD*io* from Αυδη; though others justly refer it to ATA, (Ατα,) the Doric or Tarentine word for OTA, (Ωτα,)—to an ancient Latin word AUD*es*,—to the Chaldee אוּדן AUD*in*,—the Hebrew אזן AZ*in*,—to a modern Greek word AUD*ia* for OT*ia*, (Ωτια,) all signifying *Aures*, and to the Greek *Aio*, which is quasi AJ*o*, (Αιω,) To Hear. In the French *Ouir*, and the Spanish *Oir*, the Radical Consonant has likewise been lost. To the Greek *Ata*, *Ota*, (Ατα, Ωτα,) we must add the other forms of these words, OUS, OT-*os*, OUAS, OUAT-*os*, (Ους, Ωτος, Ουας, Ουατος, Auris.) The explanation of the Hebrew Lexicographers will shew us, that these words convey the same idea as the English HEED. Taylor explains אזן AZ*n* by "To *Hearken*. To attend, to give "good *Heed*." The German ACHT, "The *Heed*, care, obser- "vance, minding, regard of a thing," might seem to belong to *Heed*, &c.; yet another sense of ACHT, "Outlawry," &c. brings us to a different idea, and a different race of words, which will be explained in another place. Taylor in his interpretation has not only, as we see, adopted the very word HEED, to which I have directed my Reader, but he has likewise used the term HEARK*en*, another of these terms. HARK and HEARK*en* belong

to

to the same idea as HEED; and they appear, we see, under the full form of the Element ^RK. The Etymologists justly refer them to the German HORCH*en*, a term of the same meaning. The succeeding word to HORCH*en* in my German Vocabulary is a term before produced,—HORDE, "A HORD, Fold or Pen for "Sheep," which brings us to the original idea of the *g*-UARD*ed* or WARD*ed* Spot, the secured YARD or EARTH, from which I suppose the idea of *Observing* or WATCH*ing* is derived. The *n* in HEARK*en* is an organical addition to the Radical K, &c., as it is in the Hebrew AZ*n*. The German *Ge-Horsam*, "Obedient, "dutiful," is a compound, of which the parts are *Hor*, *Hóren*, and *Sam;* and in the Saxon *Her*, *Hear*, *Hyr-Sumian*, we have a similar combination. The AUS in AUS*culto*, another explanatory word used by Taylor, must be referred to AUD*io*, as the Etymologists understand. In Gothic, HAUS*gan* is Audire, and in Saxon, HYRCN*ian* and HEORCN*ian* is to HEARKEN.

The Latin AURIS must be referred to OUAS—OUS, &c. (Ουας, Ους.) Martinius has produced the remark of Scaliger, which illustrates this derivation: "AUS*es*, AUD*es*, et *Aures* dicebant "veteres. AUS*is*, Ους, Ωτος. Creticè et Tarentinè Αυς, Αυτος, "AUS*es*." Martinius adds, "Nempe ab Αιω, Audio." We have seen, that *Aio* is quasi AJ*o*, AUD*io*, to HEED. The sounds of *R* and *S* are sometimes blended with each other. Hence we have Αρρην and Αρσην, and the ancient Latin forms *Asa*, *Casmen*, *Papysii*, for *Ara*, *Carmen*, *Papirii*. Hence it is, that *R* and *S* are adjacent to each other in the Alphabet. AURIS therefore may either be considered as AUS*is*, and as belonging to the form of the Element ^S; or, with the *R* bearing its ordinary sound, it may be regarded as belonging to the Element ^RS.—In the English *Hear*—and the word denoting the organ *Ear*, the sound of *S* has been lost, as it is in *Aur-em;* though I imagine that they must

must be referred to the race of words now before us, under the Element ^RS, or ^S. The Etymologists produce, as parallel to *Hear*, the Saxon *Hyran*, the Belgic *Hooren*, the German *Hören*, the Danish *Hore*, the Runic *Ad Heira*, and the Gothic *Hausgan*. They refer us likewise to *Ear*, under which they produce the Saxon *Eare*, the German *Ohr*, the Danish *Ore*, the Belgic *Oor*, the Islandic *Eyre*, the Æolic *Oar* or *Or*, (Æolicum Ωαῤ, vel Ωῤ pro Ους,) the French *Oreille*, the Italian *Orecchia*, and the Spanish *Oreja*. In some of these we perceive only the *R;* but in the Italian ORECCHIA, and the Spanish OREJA, we have the Element in its full form ^RC, ^RJ. In the Gothic HAUS-*gan*, we see likewise the true Elementary form, as in AUD*io*, &c. In Persian, هش HUSH means "Care, attention, study," and هشتیدن HUSHT*iden*, "1. To Whistle, *Hiss*, or make any noise with the lips. "2. To preserve, keep (any thing.)" In Mr. Shaw's Galic and Irish Dictionary we have "OGH. The Ear," and EISD*am*, "To "Hear, listen, be silent, attentive," and EIST*am*, "To Hear."— The English *Ear*, in the sense of *Arista*, Spica, and in that of *Arare*, belongs to our Element ^D, ^RS, ^RG, &c. EAR in the sense of *Arista* has the following parallel terms in other Languages, as they are produced by the Etymologists: *Ahs*, (Goth.) *Ear*, *Aher*, (Sax.) *Are*, (Dan.) *Aer*, *Ader*, (Belg.) *Ather*, (Αθηῤ;) and to these they should have added the Latin ARISTA, where we see the full form of the Element ^RS. The parallel terms to *Ear*, To plough, are *Arian*, (Goth.) *Erian*, (Sax.) *Arare*, (Lat. Ital.) and the Welsh *Aredig*, as they are produced by the Etymologists. The Saxon *Erian* is sometimes written ERIG*an*, where the true form appears; and thus it is in the Welsh ARED*ig*, and the Latin ARAT*rum*, which we see denote the action or the Instrument of EARTH-*ing* or turning up the EARTH. The *Culto* in *Aus-Culto*, which is parallel to the Greek *Kluo*, (Κλυω,) certainly belongs to the idea of the *En-Closure*, and even to the very word—to

Closure,

Closure, *Claudo*, &c. The *Culto* and *Kluo*, (Κλυω,) are derived from the Celtic terms, with the same meaning, Cl*uinam*, Claisd*am*, (Gal. and Ir.) To Hear. Mr. Shaw interprets *Cluinam* by "To "Hear," and *Cluin* by "A Fraud, an *Enclosure*." *Claistinam* means to Hear; and to this belongs, as we shall all agree, our word *Listen*. This will shew us, why *List* means to Hear, "*List! List! O List!*" and likewise an *Enclosure*—the *Lists* for Combat, and the *List*, the Border of a Cloth. The same Element KL supplies the terms for Hearing in other Dialects of the Celtic.—The Galic Eisd*am*, To Hear, belongs probably to "Eis*am*. To Trace,"—under the idea of *Tracing out* or Investigating what is said. The succeeding word to Eisd*am* in Mr. Shaw's Dictionary is "*Eiseadh*. Seeking, Hunting after, "Researching." These ideas of Tracing are derived from the notion of *Stirring up the Land*. In the same opening of Mr. Shaw's Dictionary I find "Eite. An addition to the Ploughshare, "when worn," and "Eitre. A trench, furrow."

Hide, signifying To *Cover*—*Conceal*, and as a noun, the Skin of a Beast, must either be classed with this race of words, denoting an *Enclosure*, or must be referred to the Earth, Erde, &c., as denoting the Surface, Top, the Superficial Covering, &c. The Etymologists produce, as parallel to Hide, the verb, the Saxon *Hydan*, Celare, the Belgic *Hoeden*, the German *Hüten*, Custodire; and they derive these words, either from the Greek Α and Ειδω, or from *Keutho*, (Κευθω.) Hide, the Skin, they justly refer to the Saxon *Hyde*, *Hyd*, the Belgic *Houde*, &c., the Danish *Hud*, the Runic *Hyd*, the German *Haut*, &c., which they derive from the verb Hide, or from *Cutis*. It is possible, that *Hide* and its parallels may be directly connected with the Element C, D, &c., and belong to *Keutho*, (Κευθω,) *Cutis*, and a great race of words of a similar kind. That Hide is derived from some idea relating to the Earth, will be manifest from the sense of Hide, denoting a Portion

a Portion of *Land*. It will not be necessary, I imagine, to prove, that it is not derived from the idea of that quantity of Land, which can be measured by a *Bull's* HIDE. This notion has not only supplied an Etymological conjecture, but has been recorded even as an Historical fact. This mistake has arisen from a confusion in words of a similar or of the same sound, denoting at once *Land*, and the *Skin of an Animal*. A story of the same sort, we know, occurs with respect to the BYRSA—the Citadel at Carthage, which has been acknowledged to be derived from an equivocal meaning in similar terms, denoting at once the Fortified Enclosure—a Citadel, Town, &c., and the Protecting Enclosure, the Skin. HIDE is interpreted by Skinner to be "Terræ portio "quæ vel ad alimoniam unius familiæ, vel ad annuum pensum "unius aratri designatur, vel ab A. S. *Hydan*, Tegere, vel *Hyd*, "Corium, priori sensu Lat. Barb. *Mansum*, et *Manerium* voci- "tatur, Latinius Bedæ Familia dicitur, et fort. idem quod Tectum "sonat, fort. quia *Domus semper huic terræ portioni annexa est.*" HIDE *of Land* seems to have originally meant the small portion of Land *Enclosed* about the Dwelling; and thus we see, how HIDE connects it with HUT—HEED—HÚTEN, (Germ.), which relate to the HEDG'*d* in—the Enclosed or Protected Spot. HIDE *and Gain* is a combination, recorded by Skinner, signifying *Terra Arabilis*. HIDEL is an old term denoting an Asylum, which is properly derived from HIDE; and the succeeding word in Skinner's Appendix of Law Terms is HID-*gild*, which he derives from *Hyde*, Corium, and *Gild*, Solutio; "q. d. Pretium, quo quis "redimit corium seu pellem, (i. e.) corpus suum."

HITH. (Eng.) A Port, a Station for vessels. The *Land*.
ECKE. (Germ.) A Fore-Land, a Nook, Angle.
ERCKEN. (Germ.) A Balcony.
HECKE. (Old Eng.) The Shore.
AKTE. (Gr.) The Shore, the fruits of the *Earth*.
ÆGE, IG, IGOTHE, IGLAND, &c. (Sax.) Insula.

Insula, ISLE, Is*land*, Is*ola*, Is*le*, Is*la*. (Lat. Eng. Ital. Fr. Span.)

Ai, or AJ. (Heb.) A Settlement, Habitation, *Isle*.
Aia, quasi AJA. (Gr.) A Country, Region, &c.
Ai, *Aoi*. (Gal.) A Region, Tract, Country, &c.

I SHALL now produce some terms, the precise idea of which is not fully manifest. HITH, signifying "Portus, navium statio," as "*Queen*-HITH, *Lamb*-HITHE, corrupte *Lambeth*," says Lye, may denote the *Enclosure* convenient for receiving Boats, &c., or it may simply express the *Land*, or Shore. HECK in old English means the *Shore*, or the projecting and extreme part of the Shore, where the idea may be that of the HEDGE or confining Boundary of the Water. The EDGE, in the sense of the *Edge* of the Water, is derived from a different idea. HECK however might possibly belong to EDGE. In German, ECKE signifies "A Corner, Angle, Nook. ECKE oder Spitze des landes, A Point, "Cape, Promontory, Fore-Land." ECKE, in its sense of a *Nook*, seems to bring us to the idea of an *Enclosure;* but in that of a *Point*, *Fore-Land*, *Spitze*, we seem to perceive the EDGE. I have derived AKTE, (Ακτη, Littus,) from an idea somewhat different, and have considered it to be the EA*r*TH, or Strong Mound, or Support, against the Water. That it is derived from the Spot, which my hypothesis supposes, is manifest from its sense of the Productions of the EARTH. (Ακτη, Farina, Fruges.)

We

We shall however be inclined to conclude, that the German ECKE is taken from the idea of *An Enclosure*, when we see another German word ERCK*en*, which signifies "A Balcoon, "Balcony, Jutty, Projecture, Jutting or Leaning out," which surely belongs to such terms as ERK*os*, (Ἕρκος, Septum.) HECK occurs in the Poems attributed to Rowley. We find it in the Hymn, which was supposed to be sung in honour of St. Wareburghus, who is described in the following manner:

"Strong ynn faithfullnesse, he trodde
"Overr the waterrs lyke a Godde,
"Till he gaynde the distaunt HECKE."

We again find this word in the same Poem:

"Thenn the foulke a brydge dydd make
"Overr the streme untoe the HECKE."

Dean Milles interprets HECKE by *Height*. (Edit. Rowley, p. 434.) I ought perhaps to produce in this place words under a very different form;—the Saxon *w*-EARTH, *w*-AROTH, *w*-AROD, which signify Littus, where we have the form of the Element ^RD; and these assuredly belong to the idea of the EARTH or Land. HECKE may denote the Shore, under the idea of the *Land*. We know, that *Land* is applied to the Shore, as To Come to *Land*—To *Land*, &c. In Saxon, ÆGE is *Insula*, the *Isle*, or *Island*; which may mean the *Land* or *Shore*, that is, the Spot, which every where supplies a Shore—or it may mean the *Enclosure*, that which is HEDG'*d* in or Surrounded by the Sea.

If we considered only the Is in *Isle* and *Island*, we should say, that it belonged to the Saxon ÆGE; yet, when we compare *Isle* and *Island* with *Insula*, we shall think, I imagine, that they are to be referred to each other; and we shall agree, I conceive, that the INS in *Insula* belongs to the Celtic terms conveying the same idea, INSH, YNYS, &c., which are attached to the Element ^N,

^N, ^NS, &c., and denote that, which takes In — In-*closes*, &c. There is still however great difficulty remaining, when we compare the Teutonic terms for an *Island* with the Celtic. It is true, that they all seem attached to each other; and yet the Teutonic terms appear to belong to the Element ^C, ^G, ^S, &c., and the Celtic to the Element ^N, ^NS. I find in Lhuyd, under *Insula*, the following article: " *Ynys*, An *Isle* or *Island*. C. " *Ennis* Ar. *Enezen*, Ir. *Innshe*, Elan. Scot. *Insh*, i." From the Celtic *Ynys* the familiar Surname *Innis* is derived. The Welsh Lexicographers understand, that the Greek Nesos, (Νησος,) belongs to these words. When the breathing before *Ynys* is lost, as *Nys*, we have the Nes in Nes-*os*, (Νησος.) Adjacent to the Welsh Ynys, I find Yng, Narrow, and Yn, the Preposition " In, At," which give the true idea annexed to Ynys — that of an In-*closed* Spot. We have the same idea in a word borrowed from this, as *Insulated* or *Isolated* Situation — the Situation Shut up — In*closed* or Separated from the rest. The Latin Ins*ula* not only signified An *Island*, but likewise a House *Inclosed* within itself, if I may so express it, without any other Houses joining to it. R. Ainsworth explains Insula by " An Island or *Isle;* a Land *Closed* " In, or *Environed* with, the Sea, or fresh water. (2.) A House " in a city having no house joined unto it, but the street on " every side; such as great men's houses were in Rome." The Etymologists derive *Insula* from *In Salo Posita;* and *Nesos*, (Νησος,) they derive from *No*, (Νω, Nato.) We see that Isle is the simpler form of *Island*, and under this form Isle we have a term relating to Buildings. N. Bailey explains " Isles (in " Architecture)" by " The Sides or Wings of a Building;" and in another article he has " Isles, (of Ailes, F. *Ala*, L. a Wing,) " Certain *Strait* passages between pews within a Church." We see in the latter interpretation the same idea, which belongs to Isle, The Island; and from that certainly it might have been derived.

derived. Yet the origin of *Ailes*, the Wings, seems direct and inevitable. Junius and Skinner produce, as the parallel terms to ISLE, ISLAND, the Spanish *Isla*, the French *Isle*, the Italian *Isola*, the Saxon *Ig*, *Igothe*, *Ygland*, *Eg*, *Egland*, the German *Alend*, now written *Eyland*, the Belgic *Eyle*, *Eyland*, the Welsh *Ynys*, the Runic *Ey*, the Danish *Oe*, and the Hebrew *Ai* אי. Junius justly observes, that our terminations *Ey*, *Y*, are derived from this source, which we find in *Ramsey*, *Sheepey*, *Eely*, &c., Arietum ovium, anguillarum insula. Martinius has observed under *Insula*, that the Swedish term for Island is *Holm*, from whence, as he says, *Stockholm* is derived. " Insula Trabium, quod trabes ex " vicinis locis in eam Insulam invectæ urbi condendæ occasionem " præbuerunt." Here a difficulty arises. It is not easy to speak with precision on the origin of these words. If we conceive, that the Celtic terms attached to the Element ^N do not belong to the other words above produced, ISLE, &c.; and if we suppose, that *Insula* is quasi *Isula*; we should then be of opinion, that *Isle*, *Insula*, *Isola*, are derived from the Element ^S, ^G, IG, EG, and SL, *Solum*, both bearing a similar meaning. Another difficulty will then arise with respect to *Island*—*Egland*. The word *Island* we should suppose to be a compound of *Isle* and *Land*; yet *Egland* seems to be a compound of EG and *Land;* and yet they still appear to be the same composition.—Perhaps the *Land* may not be significant, and the *N* may be only an organical addition to the L. I shall shew in another Volume, that *Land* itself is derived from the Element SL, SOL*um*, &c., and that the *N* is only an organical addition to the L. Let us note the changes of the Element SL. The SL, when it has lost the *S*, becomes ^L, and when there is an organical addition of the *n* or *m* to *L*, we have the Scotch *Elan*, and the Swedish *Holm*. Under *Island*, in Mr. Shaw's Galic and Irish Dictionary, we have " *Oilein*, *Eilain*, *Innis*, *I.*" *England* is supposed to be the *Land* of

of the *Angles*, as the Etymologists imagine. It might however be the *Eggland*, or *Igland*, or *Island*. Yet this is not perhaps the true derivation, as we do not see any thing of this in *Anglia*, unless *Anglia* should be the *Agglia* or *Islia*—the Isle. We might suppose, that *Anglia* and *England* meant the Country or *Land* of the *Galli* or *Celts*, without passing through the medium of the *Angles*.—If this medium should be imagined, we shall have the same idea. The *Angles* or *A-Gles* are the Galli or Celts.

The Island of *Ceylon* may be the *Ceyl Eilain*, the *Island* of the *Celts*. The natives of this *Island* are called *Cin*-Glasses. This is curious. Even under the very form Glasses we have in Shakspeare the name of a Celtic tribe:

> "The merciless Macdonwald,
> ——"from the western Isles
> "Of Kernes, and *Gallo*-Glasses is supplied." (*Macbeth*, A. I. S. 2.)

The portion Gallo is only a different form of the words denoting Celtic Tribes. The Cin is another name, by which the *Celts* are denominated. "Aneurim, Taliessin's contemporary, in the "conclusion of his Gododin, distributes the Celtæ of the British "Islands into Cynt, a Gwyddil, a *Phrydin*;" (Davies' Celtic Researches, p. 129.) that is, the Cynt—or Cins, and the Gwyddil, the Galatæ, the Celtæ, the Gauls, &c. &c., and the Britains. The GL, CL, may be considered as the name of the Nation; the Gall—Race. The *T* or *D* is an organical addition to the *L*; and as it precedes or follows, we have the *Gwyddil*, the *Guideli*, *Gadeli*, by which the Irish are commonly called, and the *Galatæ* or *Celtæ*. The race of the *Cymri* was supposed to have been brought by *Hu Gadarn*, into the Island of Britain, from the Land of *Hav*, called *Defrobani*, as Mr. Davies has observed in his Celtic Researches, pp. 154, 165, &c. This information is derived from the Welsh Triads; and a Commentator,

a Commentator, at least as old as the twelfth Century, according to the opinion of Mr. Davies, supposes, that *Defrobani* was the name of a place, where Constantinople now stands; and Mr. Davies explains the term according to this opinion, by " *Dy-vro-banau*, the *Land of eminences*, or *high points*, *Thrace* in " general, or else *Dyvro-Banwy*, the *Land* or *vale* of the *Peneus*, " *Thessaly*, Hæmonia." *Defrobani* is the *Taprobane* of the Ancients, or the Island of *Ceylon*. This Island is likewise called *Serendib*. — In Sanscrit, *Div* is an Island, and *Seren* is quasi *Selan*, the Island of *Ceylon*. This change of the *R* and *L* is perpetual among the Eastern nations, and it is acknowledged in this case by Bochart. (Geograph. Sac. p. 693.) When the Chinese bargain with our countrymen for *Rice*, they amuse the purchasers by this confusion of sounds. The Island is called *Salica*, and the Inhabitants *Salæ* by Ptolemy, &c. The *Div*, denoting an Island, belongs to DAP*edon*, (Δαπεδον, Pavimentum, Solum, &c.) TAPIS, (Fr.) &c. Bochart derives *Taprobane* from טהפרן *Taph-Parvan*, vel *Taph*-Provan, id est, " ακτην της Παρουαν vel της Προβαν." (p. 692.) On the origin of this term I have not yet satisfied my mind. *Taprobane* is perhaps the TAP — or DIV, or Island, of the BANI — the PŒNI — PHŒN*icians*, &c., — another form of the CINS, QUINS, &c. This change is likewise acknowledged. The famous work of Bochart on the PHŒN*icians* is called CHAN*aan*. In the same page of Mr. Davies's work, in which we have the quotation produced above, respecting the name of the CYNTS, we find that Taliessin calls his Countrymen, CYN-*wys*, or Echen GYN*wys*. The GYN*wys* brings us to the GWEN*et*; and Mr. Davies observes in a preceding page, " In this corner of Asia, we find " the *Heneti*, or *Veneti*, which pronounced by a Celt would be " HEN*et*, KYN*et*, or GWEN*et*, well known tribes, wherever the " Celtæ are found." — The same change takes place in another name of the Celtic tribe; and thus we have the *Galli*, *Gauls*,

Welsh,

Welsh, *Belgæ*, &c. This mingled sound of the *G* and *U* is perpetual, and from hence, we know, has arisen the Latin *Q*, to which a *U* is always subjoined. Hence we have Guerre, *War*, *Gualterus*, *Walter*, &c. &c. To the name of this Celtic tribe belong the familiar appellations *Quin*, *Winne*, &c. Hence we have in the names of Countries, *Chanaan*, *China*, *Gentoo*, *Hindoo*, *India*, &c. &c., Cin-*Glasses*, &c., and *Phœnicia*, *Pœni*, *Hi*-Bernia, *Al*-Bion, &c., Al-Ban*ique* patres, &c. &c. The *Al* is the *g-AL* or Gal. I shall proceed no further on the present occasion; yet even this, I trust, is enough to rouse the Celtic Scholar from his sleep, which has been so long and so profound.

The Hebrew אי AI or *AJ*, above recorded, belongs to our Element ^J, ^G, &c. It denotes in general the spot of Ground, the *Place* or EA*r*TH, A*r*Z, &c., where a person is situated. It means, says Mr. Parkhurst, "A Settlement, Habitation," &c. &c.; who observes, that the versions and Lexicons usually render this word by an *Isle* or *Island;* though he adds, "It may be "justly doubted whether it ever had strictly this meaning." It is used likewise as an adverb of *Place*, with or without an Interrogation, *Where*, *Whence*, &c. &c. Mr. Parkhurst, in his account of this Hebrew term, observes, "Hence also the Greek Αια often "used in Homer, for a *Country* or *Region*." The Greek *Aia*, (Αια, Terra,) is quasi Aja, and belongs likewise to our *Element* denoting the EA*r*TH, A*r*Z, &c. &c. The Lexicographers tell us, that *Aia* is "per aphæresin pro Γαια." The Greek *Ge*, *Gaia*, (Γη, Γαια, Terra,) is quasi Age, Agaia, &c. &c., where the vowel breathing before our Element ^J^, ^G^ is lost, or when it becomes J^, G^, &c. In the Galic and Irish Dialect of the Celtic, Aoi, which I consider to be quasi Aoj, denotes "An *Island*, "a Trade, a Hill, Possession;" and again we have Ai, Aoi, "A Region, Tract, or Territory." The same words signify "An *Herd*, also a Cow or Sheep;" and they likewise mean

"Inheritance

"Inheritance of Land, Possession." We find, that *I* means an *Island*, and hence, *I Cholum Cille*, says Mr. Shaw, *Icolmkill*, or the Island of St. Columbus. It is curious, that the *I* should remain in all these words, Celtic, Hebrew, and Greek, as a record of its kindred letter *J*, the Radical Consonant.

Words, signifying To *Hold*, *Have*, *Possess*, &c., as a certain Spot of EA*r*TH, A*r*K, &c. &c.

Echo. (Gr.) To Hold—Have—Possess. To Hold or Confine, as within a Fence—Enclosure—Bounds, &c.

Aigan — Agan, &c. (Goth. Sax.) To Hold — Have — Possess, &c.

Aigin, Aihn, Agen, Eigen, Egen, Own, &c. &c. (Goth. Sax. Germ. Dan. Eng. &c.) Proprius.

Agen. (Sax.) Contra, Iterum, or Against—Again. (Eng.)

Æht—Æhte. (Sax.) Possessio, Hæreditas.

Æhte-*Man*. (Sax.) Colonus.

Ought. (Eng.) Debeo, What a person Has in charge to do.

Ought or Aught. (Eng.) Any thing, What a person Has or Possesses.

Aucht. (Scotch,) Res, facultates, possessio.

Head — Hood, Had, Heit, Hed, &c. (Eng. Sax. Germ. Dan. &c.) The State, Quality, or *Property* of any thing. What a person Has or Possesses, as peculiar to himself.

Ead. (Sax.) Possession, Felicity, Prosperity.

Ed*ric*, Ed*win*, Ed*ward*, &c. &c.

I have before produced the Greek Echo, (Ἐχω, Habeo, Possideo, Teneo; — Cohibeo, Reprimo; — Cingo, Circumdo; — Habito, Incolo;) which, as we have seen, conveys at once the idea of *Having — Holding* or *Possessing* any thing, as a certain Spot of Ground; and that of *Holding* or *Enclosing*, as within a Fence.

In the sense of *Habito*, *Incolo*, we are at once brought to the EA/TH, A/K, &c., or EATH, AK, &c. We have seen, that EARD-*ian*, To EARTH, signifies "Habitare, Incolere." In Ec*ho*, (Εχω,) denoting *Cingo*, we see the E/K-*os*, (Ερκος, Septum,) when the sound of *r* is lost. In Gothic, AIG*an* signifies *Habere;* and in Saxon, AG*an*, Æ*Gan*, and Æ*Gnian*, mean Possidere; which belong to ECHO, (Εχω.) The preceding word to Æ*Gnian*, Possidere, is ÆGN, Proprius; to which, as the Etymologists duly understand, belongs the English *Own*. They have referred us under *Own* to the Gothic *Aigin*, *Aihn*, the Saxon *Agen*, the German *Eigen*, the Danish *Egen*, the Belgic *Eygen*, the Runic *Eiga*, the Islandic *Eyga*, the Greek *Echo*, (Εχω,) and the Saxon and Gothic verbs, above produced. Meric Casaubon supposes, that *Own* is derived from *Oneomai*, (Ωνεομαι, Emo.) These words however might create some difficulty. The English *Own* certainly belongs to the form ^G, to *Ægn*, where the *n* may be an organical addition to the *G;* or it might have been taken from the form of the Infinitive *Agan*, *Ægn*, from which another Infinitive might have been afterwards formed, *Ægnian*. We should agree, I think, in deciding, that the AG, ÆG, in AG*an*, and Æ*Gnian*, belong to ECHO, (Εχω;) and when we see Æ*Gn*, Proprius, adjacent to *Ægnian*, we cannot but refer that Adjective and its parallels to this verb of Possession. Yet I must observe, that if *Ægn* had not thus connected itself with *Ægnian*, I should have considered it as belonging to the Element ^G, denoting *Being*, *This* or *That* Being—Person—Self, Is, HIC, (Lat.) IT, &c. &c.; so that *Ægn* would have been an adjective derived from this idea, just as *Suus* is derived from *Sui*, or *Eos* and *Spheteros*, (Εος, Σφετερος, Suus,) from *E* and *Sphe*, (Ε, Σφε, Se.) This certainly might have been the origin of the Adjective *Ægn;* and even the verb of Possession might have been derived from it, as *Spheterizo* (Σφετεριζω, Meum facio,) is taken from *Spheteros*, (Σφετερος.) I must observe, moreover, that

that in the same column of my Saxon Dictionary, where *Ægn*, Proprius, and *Ægnian*, Possidere, are found, we have *Ægther*, Uterque, where the *Æg* undoubtedly denotes *Being*, and is to be referred to the race of words, which I have recorded.

The article succeeding *Agen*, Proprius, is *Agen*, Contra, Adversus; — Iterum, Denuo. In the *Agen*, 'Contra, Adversus,' we are brought to our English word AGAINST; and in that of "Iterum, denuo," to our word AGAIN. All these terms belong to each other. AGEN, signifying "Contra, Adversus," is AGEN, Proprius; from the idea, that what is Peculiar or Appropriate to a person, or what is the Property of a person, implies an *Exclusive* right in *Opposition* to any one else; and hence it means *In Opposition to*, or AGAINST. The idea of actions or circumstances being put AGAINST each other, brings us to the notion of something *Reciprocal — Mutual —* or *Recurring;* and hence we have AGEN, *Again*, "Iterum, denuo." — When we say, in a case of contention, "If you do so and so, I will do the same AGAIN "to you," we have at once expressed by this word, the sense of AGAINST, with the reciprocal action AGAIN. In the Language of the people, *Again* is used for *Against;* and in a phrase like the preceding, "If you hit me, I'll hit you AGAIN," we hardly know, which sense of the Saxon AGEN, "Contra — Iterum," would suit best with the idea. The Latin *Contra* signifies at once AGAINST and AGAIN. Robert Ainsworth explains *Contra* in one sense by "Mutually, reciprocally," "Quæ me amat, quam "*Contra* amo," She who loves me, I love her AGAIN. The Etymologists place AGAIN and AGAINST in two separate articles; the former of which they derive from *Agen*, (Sax.) *Angehen*, (Germ.) Aggredi, *Eac*, (Sax.) Iterum, &c.; and the latter from *Agen*, *Ongean*, (Sax.) *Gegen*, *Entgegen*, (Germ.) Contra, &c., and even from the Greek Κατα. "Dr. Mer. Cas. mirabiliter defl. a Gr. "Κατα," says Skinner. The German *Gegen* is *Egen*, *Agen*, &c.

In

In the same column of my Saxon Dictionary, where *Ægnian* occurs, we have *Æht, Æhte,* which Lye interprets by " Possessio, " *Hæreditas.*" We see in the interpretation Hæred*itas,* the same idea under the form ^RD, which directly brings us to the Earth, Erde, &c. &c. In the quotation produced under Æht, we find the word in combination with the term, to which it belongs: " Theah he ealne middan-Eard on Æht begite. Licet " universam Terrarum orbem lucretur." The succeeding words are " Æht, Æhte. Æstimatio;—Æhta. Octo;—Æhte, ab *Agan.* " Æhte-*Land.* Terra Possessionis. Æhte-*Man.* Colonus, Agri- " cola, Laborator;" and we have adjacent to these terms " Æhtige. Divites," and Æker. *Ager,* &c. Let us note the *Æst* in *Æstimatio,* or *Æst-Timatio,* which might belong to Æht; but the *Æ* may be only an organical addition to the ST in S̄T̄-M, or T-M, which is a Radical. In Italian, the word is *Stimare.*— I shall not attempt to produce the various forms in Saxon and Gothic, under which these terms appear, as *Ahjan,* (Goth.) Existimare, *Eht,* (Sax.) Æstimatio, &c. &c. The German Acht, *Heed,* care, observance, &c., Acht*en,* " To care, *Esteem,* respect, " regard, observe, mind a thing, make account of it, value it," might be referred to these words *Eht,* &c., denoting *Property*— *Value,* or to Heed. Acht means likewise in German, " The " outlawry, proscription, outlawring, banishment;" where Acht belongs to that race of words, attached to our Element, which signify To *Stir up* or Cultivate the Land—*Exercere* Terram; and hence, To *Stir up, Rout up, Disturb, Plague,* or *Exercere* in general.

It is curious to observe, how the terms, which I have now under discussion, are intermingled with this race of words; or rather, it is curious to mark these senses, which appear so different, belonging to the same words, or to words directly connected with each other. The term preceding Eht, Æstimatio, is the verb

verb EHT*an*, Persequi; which is attached to the idea, conveyed by a word in the preceding column, E*Gean*, Occare. These words directly belong to each other, as the two senses of ACHT, Value and Banishment, do; and they are all to be considered only as different forms of each other. We have only to imagine, that these words are applied in the two senses of Cultivating or *Stirring up Land*, and afterwards of *Stirring up* or *Disturbing* in general; and likewise of Possession — Value, &c. We know, that COLO has the double sense of Tilling or Cultivating the Land, and of Inhabiting it.—Whatever be the precise process, by which these words receive such meanings; the fact, about which only I am interested, is certain, that these terms belong to the Ground. We have seen, that *Æ*HTE-*Man* is the " Colonus, " Agricola, Laborator." In all cases EHT would signify EARTH, and EHTE *Man*, the EARTH *Man*, either as the *Possessor* or *Cultivator*.—If *Æ*HTE-*Man* had been explained ' Vir Terram *Exercens*,' we should not have wondered to see a term belonging to it, as EHT*an*, explained by EXERCERE, Exagitare, *Persequi*. Let us mark the ERC in *Ex*-ERC*ere*; which I shall shew to belong to the form of our Element ^RC, &c., signifying to EARTH up, or to Stir up the EARTH, ARK, &c.

There are some words in Saxon denoting *Happiness—Prosperity*, which are derived from these terms, signifying *Possession—Property*, &c. Thus EAD, AUD, Island. signifies, according to Lye, " Possessio; — Fœlicitas, Beatitudo; — Res Prosperæ;" and EADEG, EADIG, mean respectively " Beatus," and " Beatus; " — Dives." Again, ED is explained by " Fœlicitas; — Salus, " Servator, Asylum;" and this might remind us of the Greek UG*ies*, (Υγιης, Sanus, valens, &c. — Bonus, &c.) and EUS, (Ευς, Bonus, Strenuus;) though I have classed these terms under a different race of words. Perhaps the Greek ED*us*, (Ηδυς, Suavis, Jucundus;—Lætus, Lepidus,) may belong to ED; yet here great difficulties

difficulties occur.—The Etymologists have understood, that from such terms as EAD, Fœlicitas, a series of proper names has been formed. Skinner derives from EAD, the names *Edith*, *Edmund*, *Edric*, *Edward*, *Edwy*, *Edbald*, *Eadbert*, *Eadgar*, *Eadulph*, *Edwin*, &c. &c. *Edward* is explained by Skinner, Felicitatis custos, vel Felix custos. *Edward* means the *Ward* of the ED, the Property or Land. We have seen, that *Hayward* is the *Ward* of the HEDGE, or *Enclosed Property*. In the succeeding column of my Saxon Dictionary to that, in which *Ead*, &c. is found, we have *Eadmed*, Humilitas, *Eadmod*, Humilis, where *Ead* seems directly to denote the Ground; as Humilis, we know, belongs to *Humus*. *Med* or *Mod* belongs to the Saxon "*Mod*, Mood. Mens, animus."

In Mr. Shaw's Galic Dictionary I find "ADH, AGH. Felicity, "good luck," "ED. Gain, Profit, advantage;" and in three other articles, we have a word under the same form, ED, denoting, "To "make, receive, to handle;"—"Defence, Protection;"—"Cattle." In the same column we have "EDim. To Catch, apprehend." To this race of words, EAD, ED, &c., the Latin UTor, Usus, and its parallel terms in modern Languages, *Use*, *User*, (Fr.) &c. may belong. The original idea of UTor seems to be that of *Possessing* or *Having* any thing. R. Ainsworth explains it under this idea of *Having*;—"To *Have* the USE or Benefit of.—To *Have*, or "enjoy.—To *Have*, even what we would not." In *Usurpo*, To Usurp, "To take another's Property," we see fully the idea of *Property* and *Possession*. The preceding term in Lye's Saxon Dictionary to AGnian, Possidere, is *Agnette*, *Usura*; where we perceive how one sense of UTOR, namely, that of USURA, is connected with the idea of *Possession*. In Mr. Shaw's Galic Dictionary, IDH is "*Use*;" and a word under the same form is explained in another article by "A wreath or chain; a ridge;" which may mean the HEDGE or Fence, Surrounding or Holding in any thing. In the preceding column we have IATH. *Land*, and

and IATH*am*. "To Surround, move round." The Saxon *Est*, Munificentia,—Amor, gratia, &c., *Estas*, Deliciæ, Epulæ, seem to belong to EAD, Possessio;—Fœlicitas, beatitudo;—*Res prosperæ*. Adjacent words to this are EST, "Superlativorum terminatio "Anglo Saxonica," and EST, the *East*, which I explain in other portions of my work.

HOOD or HEAD, as in *Knight*-HOOD, *Maiden*-HEAD, &c., denotes *Property*—Quality—State or Condition of any thing or Person; and belongs to this race of words, denoting *Property* of another kind. *Knight*-HOOD, &c. is that state, which a Knight *Possesses*, as Peculiar or *Proper* to himself. Thus the original sense of HOOD and HEAD, and the secondary sense, have the same relation to each other, as *Estate* bears to *State*, and as *Property*, in the sense of a Possession, has to *Property* in the sense of Quality. The Etymologists refer us under HOOD to the Saxon *Had*, *Hade*, conditio, the German *Heit*, the Danish *Hed*, and the Belgic *Heyd*, the Islandic *Hauttur*, Modus, &c. HAD among other things is applied to an Ecclesiastical condition, "Ordo Ecclesiasticus;" and hence *Hadian* means "Ordinare, "consecrare." In the same column we have *Hador*, Serenus; which seems to belong to the German *Heiter*, explained on another occasion, as attached to *Æther*, and *Hadrian*, Angustare, which belongs to *Edor*, Sepes, explained likewise in another place. Whence HAD-*Swæpa* or *Swapa*, "Pronuba, paranympha," in the same column, is derived, I do not precisely understand. The Islandic HAUTTUR, *Modus*, will explain to us the Saxon HYTH, "*Modus*, Commodum, quæstus," where we have the Sort —Condition—Mode, and the Value or Property. We shall now understand, how HOOD, the Covering for the Head, Cucullus, bearing the same form as HOOD, the State or Condition, agree with each other. HOOD, the Covering, is that, which *Holds* or contains; and HOOD, the Property or Quality, is that which

a person

a person *Holds*—*Has*, or *Possesses*. Hood, Cucullus, with its parallel terms, *Hod*, (Sax.) *Hoed*, &c. (Belg.) *Hut*, (Germ.) Pileus, &c., has been referred to the German *Hüten*, Custodire, &c. These words bring us to Hat, Hut, &c., to Heed, the term of *Guard* and Protection, and to Hedge, the *Hold*, which Contains or Confines things within a *Fence*.—Let us mark the explanatory term *Has*, and remember *Had*, which do not belong to the Element ^S, ^D, denoting Possession; but are terminations of the verb, quasi *Haves*, *Haved*. We have seen, that Æhta, Octo, is adjacent to *Æht*, *Æstimatio;* and they might possibly belong to each other, from the numeral expressing a *Valuable* or *Considerable* Quantity—Much—Many. Our ideas concerning what is great or little are proportioned to the range of our knowledge. Eight appears in a great variety of Languages, as *Ahta*, (Goth.) *Eahta*, (Sax.) *Atta*, (Run. and Dan.) *Acht*, (German and Belg.) *Okto*, *Oktoo*, (Lat. Gr. Οκτω,) *Otto*, (Ital.) *Ocho*, (Span.) *Huict* or *Huit*, (Fr.) which the Etymologists have produced. In the Dialect of the Gipsies Okto is *Eight*, and in Persian it is هشت *Husht*. In the Dialects of the Celtic we have the Welsh *Uyth*, the Cornish *Eath*, the Armoric *Eith*, and the Irish *Oχt*, for the same numeral, as they are represented by Lhuyd.

The word, which immediately precedes *Ægan*, Possidere, is Æg, Ovum, which may perhaps mean, that which *Contains*, *Holds* or *Has*, by way of eminence, according to the old Proverb, in which in order to express abundance of any thing, we say, "A person is as full of such a thing, as an Egg is full of meat." The parallel terms to Egg produced by the Etymologists are the Saxon *Æg*, the Danish and Islandic *Egg*, the German and Belgic *Ey*, the Welsh *Wy*, the French *Oeuf*, the Italian *Ovo*, and the Spanish *Huevo*. These latter words, the French *Oeuf*, &c., directly connect themselves with the Latin *Ovum*. Under *Ovum*

in

in Lhuyd we find the Welsh *Uy*, the Cornish *Oi*, the Armoric *Ui*, and the Irish *Ugh*, *Ork*. It is difficult to decide on the precise idea annexed to EGG and its parallels. I have already given one derivation, and others might be added with some appearance of probability. I have supposed, that ORCH*is*, (Ορχις, Testiculus, Oliva,) belongs to ERK*os*, (Ερκος, Septum,) denoting the Sur-*Rounding* Fence, or the *Round*-about Fence, from the idea of the *Round*—Swelling figure of these objects. The term EGG may have the same relation to HEDGE—*Æg an*, Possidere. In Irish, as we see, we have the form ORC, which should be considered perhaps as directly belonging to the idea, which I supposed to be attached to ORCH*is*, (Ορχις.)

Some refer HATCH and EGG to each other; and Skinner supposes EGG to be the primitive. On the origin of HATCH, likewise, some difficulties occur. HATCH, with its parallel German word HECK*en*, is referred by some to HACK, Concidere, "quoniam sc. aves, cum excludunt ova, rostris suis *Conscindunt*, "et perrumpunt putamina."—HATCH might belong to a word under the same form, HATCH, a Bolt, HATCHES of a Ship, &c., under the idea of *Confining*—*Shutting up* or *over*—*Covering up* or *over*, in the process of *Incubation*. Whether HATCH, the Bolt, and *Hatches* of a Ship, belong to HEDGE—To Fence in—Confine, &c., or to another idea, must be explained in a different place. I shall shew, that HATCH, the Bolt, HOOK, HUG, &c., in their sense of *Confining*—*Holding*, &c., may be derived from the idea of *Catching*—*Snatching* or *Twitching up;* and may thus belong to terms, which relate to the *Vellication* of a Surface, as HACK, &c. We at once see, that *Capio*, To *Hold*, Confine, belongs to CARPO, To *Carp*, or *Vellicate* a Surface.—The term HATCH, in its metaphorical notion, to HATCH up mischief, is derived from the continued process of *Incubation;* which would lead us to think, that it belongs to HATCH, under the sense of *Confining*—

Shutting up or *over*, &c., whatever may be the source, from which this sense is derived.

Egg and *Ovum* seem to belong to two different Radicals. Ov*um*, with its parallels, *Oeuf*, (Fr.) *Ovo*, (Ital.) *Huevo*, (Span.) is attached probably to the Element ^B, ^V, and should be referred to *Habeo*, *Have*, &c. The Greek *Ooon*, (Ωον,) may perhaps belong to *Ovum;* but on this I cannot decide. Egg and *Ovum* might however have originally belonged to the same Element; as we find in a variety of instances, that when the sound of the Radical *G* is lost, the labial vowel sound of *U* (if I may so express it,) is substituted, which sometimes passes into the sound of the Labial Consonant. We are all aware of the union of the G and U, V, when the sound of U or V succeeds G; to express which, we know, the Latins adopted the *Q* with the *U* after it. The other case differs only from this, by the sound of *U* and *V* preceding that of G. Thus *Saw*, the Proverb and the Action of Scraping, belongs to *Saeghe*, Dictio, *Saga*, Serra, &c. " Mutato " *G* in *W*," says Junius, " cujus mutationis plurima alibi ad- " duximus exempla," *Maw* to *Maga*, (Sax.) &c. &c.; and *Tough* —*Rough*, &c. are pronounced *Tuff*, *Ruff*. Such is the difficulty with respect to the terms denoting Egg, under the forms ^G and ^V.

Some might doubt respecting the word *Owe*, whether it should be referred to *Have*, or to Æg*an*, Possidere, &c. Junius, under *Owe*, quotes only the Islandic *Eg aa*, Debeo; and Skinner refers it to the German *Uben*, Exercere. In old English, Owe signifies simply to Possess — *Have* — *Own*. It is frequently used by Shakspeare, as every one knows, in this sense,—

" *Ant. E.* What art thou, that keep'st me out from the house I *Owe?*"
(*Comedy of Errors*, A. III. S. 1.)

which Mr. Steevens interprets by " I *Own*." It occurs in a very obscure

obscure passage of *Measure for Measure*, where it is unquestionably applied, whatever may be the meaning of the sentiment conveyed, to *Possession of Land:*

" *Isab.* Else let my brother die,
" If not a feodary, but only he
" OWE, and succeed by weakness." (Act II. S. 4.)

Dr. Johnson observes, that " To OWE is, in this place, To *Own*, " to hold, or have possession." I shall not entangle myself with the difficulties of the passage, which do not relate to the sense of the word before us. The verb OUGHT, ' He OUGHT to ' do so,' belongs, I think, to *Cwe*, as some imagine; and here we have the record of the Element ^G, &c., and in Scotch we have the same record, where *Awe*, AUCHT, AWCHT, AUGHT, signify To *Owe*. Thus, then, the verb OUGHT, in such phrases as " He OUGHT to do so and so," means, " He *Has* to do " so and so." The sense of OUGHT is actually expressed in Spanish by the verb corresponding with To *Have*, *Habeo*, and *Teneo*, which on other occasions is expressed by that corresponding with *Debeo*. Del Pueyo in his Spanish Grammar calls that tense the Second Future, which is formed " with the Auxiliary *He*, " *Tengo*, or *Debo*, and the Infinitive mood with *de* before it; " as *He*, or *Tengo de dar*, I am to give, *Debo de dar*, or *Debo* " *dar*, I *am obliged*, I *must* give;" and so in other tenses.

OUGHT, the adjective, the Etymologists have referred to the Saxon *Owiht*, *Awiht*, *Aht*, *Owuht*, *Uht;* which they derive from the Saxon *Wiht*, and which Lye explains by " Creatura, animal, " res." The Saxon *Wiht* corresponds with the English *Wight*, which should be considered perhaps as belonging to the Element BT, WT. OUGHT, Aliquid, belongs to OUGHT, the verb, under the idea of what a person *Has* or *Possesses;* and hence the word would signify, Any thing *Possessed*—Any thing belonging to a person. The phrases such as, ' If he has OUGHT left,' would then

then mean, If he has any *Property* or *Possession* left. *Having* is used in the same sense for *Property*, as "Of noble *Having*," in *Macbeth*—"My *Having* is not much," in the *Twelfth Night*, as every one knows; and Lye accordingly explains the Saxon *Hæfen* by "Habens. Item, Illa, quæ habentur ab aliquo. Res, "Bona." Lye in his Edition of Junius has the term AUCHT, as used by G. Douglas, which he explains by "Res, facultates, "possessio." He refers this word to the Saxon *Ahte*, *Æhte*, from *Agan*, Habere, and the English *Aught*. AUGHT or OUGHT, Aliquid, might have belonged with greater probability to our Element ^G, ^T, &c., denoting *This* or *That* Being—Thing—IT, &c. &c.; yet the form of the corresponding word AHT, which signifies *Aliquid*, and which is likewise the third person of the Preterite of AGan, To Have, fixes us, I think, to the explanation above given. The English *Nought* is supposed to be derived from the negative, and this word *Ought*; which is a most direct, and apparently true derivation. Yet if *Nought* belongs to the parallel words, produced by the Etymologists; to the German *Nicht*, corresponding with *Not*, &c. &c., this, I imagine, is not the fact. The terms *Not*—*Nicht* belong to the Negative and the Element ^S, ^T, denoting *This* or *That* Being—Thing.

From the form of *Ey*, when the Radical consonant is lost, the Etymologists have derived AIRIE, a nest, as *Airie* of Hawks; and the meaning of the term they have conceived to be quasi *Ovorum repositorium*. This may possibly be; but the Reader will be astonished, I imagine, to learn, that some conceive the French *Aire* or *Air*, in the sense of *Mien*, "De bon Air," to be derived from the same source, "Ab *Aire*, Nidus accipitrum, et, "secundario, Indoles, Ingenium; q. d. peculiaris quædam faciei "indoles," says Skinner, to which Junius agrees. Nothing can be more preposterous than this idea. *Aire* is in French at once An *Area*, and the Nest of a Bird of prey; and the *Airie* may possibly

possibly mean only the *Area*, or receptacle for the young ones of Birds. It might mean the Nest placed aloft in the *Air*. The term *Aiery* occurs in Shakspeare in conjunction with another word, which is supposed to be derived from the same root. "But there is, sir, an *Aiery* of Children, little *Eyases*, that cry "out on the top of question, and are most tyrannically clapp'd "for't." On which Mr. Theobald remarks, that "Little EYASES" are "young nestlings, creatures just out of the *Egg*." Mr. Malone observes, from Skinner, that the word comes from "*Ey*, "Teut. ovum, q. d. qui recens ex ovo emersit;" and he adds, moreover, "An *Aiery*, or *Eyerie*, as it ought rather to be written, "is derived from the same root, and signifies both "a young "brood of Hawks, and the nest itself, in which they are produced. "An *Eyas* Hawk is sometimes written a *Nyas* Hawk, perhaps "from a corruption that has happened in many words in our "Language, from the letter *n* passing from the end of one "word to the beginning of another. However some Etymologists "think *Nyas* a legitimate word." Skinner produces as parallel to *Nyas*, the French *Niais*, and the Italian *Nidiace*, Accipiter Nidarius, Πωλοτροφος, a Fr. G. *Nid*, Lat. *Nidus;* and from hence, as he says, might be derived the French *Niais*, Stultus, "q. d. "Infans, qui nunquam extra domum paternam profectus est, "mores hominum non intelligit." He adds however, "Hæc "licet valde probabilia sint, tamen eo propendet animus ut "credam nostrum *Nyas*, et Fr. G. *Niais*, non Latinæ sed Ger- "manicæ esse originis, sc. à nostro *an Eyas*, vel *Eyess Hawk*, "Accipiter apotrophus, hoc à Teut. *Ey*, Ovum, q. d. Accipiter "qui recens ex ovo emersit." This is all the evidence, which can be produced on the origin of these words, concerning which the Reader must form his own judgment.

It must be observed, however, that the form *Nyas* for an Hawk appears to have been a very ancient form; and from this I imagine

I imagine to be derived the fable, that Nis*us* was changed into a Hawk. The fable seems to be taken from a confusion in terms between the name Nis*us*, and the Nyas, the *Hawk*. Nis*us* is the Latin for the *Hawk*, as alluding to the Story. (Virg. Georg. I. v. 404.) The Etymologists derive *Nisus* from the Hebrew נץ NZ, which Mr. Parkhurst explains by " A Hawk," derived from נצה NZA, " To *shoot, break,* or *burst forth* or *out*"—" from his *rapid* " *flight,*" says this Lexicographer, " or *shooting away* in flying." Others derive it from נשר NSR, which Mr. Parkhurst explains by " To *lacerate, cut* or *tear in pieces.* Thus the cognate V. נסר" NSR " is used in Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic; in which last " language it is particularly applied to a *Bird's tearing in pieces* " its prey with its beak." The word נשר NSR means in Hebrew a Saw—an Eagle, from the same property; and to this Radical we must refer the Nis*us*, the Hawk. The name of the Hawk, under the Element ^NS, &c., and the Hebrew נסר NSR, To tear to pieces, belongs to such words as *Unguis*, *Onux*, (Ονυξ,) &c. When the breathing before the N is lost, we have the form *Nux*. In the Russian Dialect of the Sclavonic, we have this form *Nochte*, the Nails; and let us note the explanatory term *Nails*, in German *Nagel*, &c., where the *Nag* has the same meaning as *Nyas* has, the Tearer. Thus, then, *Nyas* should be considered as the original form, and *Eyas* as the Derivative.

Scylla, his daughter, is supposed to be changed into a Lark. This too has arisen from a confusion in names. In Persian, خول *Khawl* is a Lark, and in Armoric it is Zhil*uet*. The *Alauda* is the Element ^L, when the first consonant S in S-L is lost, and the D is an organical addition to the L. The English term *Lark* is the *Laud* in *Alauda*. The Element KL, SL signifies in these words the *Head*—the *Top*, and belongs to the Latin Gal*ea*—the English Scull, &c. The Bird is so named "ab " apice, quem in Capite gerit;" and hence it is called Galerita.

In

In Greek it is called *Korudos*, (Κορυδος, Galerita, Alauda cristata,) from the *Korus*, (Κορυς, Galea;) and in another term for it, *Korud*-ALLIS, Korud-ALLOS, &c. (Κορυδαλλις, Κορυδαλλος,) The ALLIS and ALLOS belong to the ALAUDA. In the fable, to which I have above alluded, SCYLLA cuts off a *Lock* or *Tuft of Hair* from her father's *Head;* and here again the idea of a *Tuft of Hair on the Head* was introduced into the fable, from a confusion of terms in the name of the woman SCYLLA—and SCYLLA, the Head—or SCULL. Through the whole compass of Language, SL, GL, denotes what relates to the *Head*, or SCULL.—In the Irish Dialect of the Celtic, COLL is the *Nead*; and in Persian, KULLEH كله is the *Head*. In short, SL, GL, &c. denotes the *Earth*—the SOL*um*—the SOIL; and hence it is used for the Surface—the Top—the *Head*, &c. &c.

That many of the Fables of Mythology have arisen from a confusion in names, we shall readily acknowledge; and those, who have undertaken to unravel the mazes of that great Labyrinth, have not been unmindful of so obvious a fact, nor have they failed to produce various instances, in which this cause might be supposed to have operated. They have however seen nothing of the wide extent, through which this fact may be traced, nor have they formed any conception of those diversified appearances, under which it may possibly be concealed.—The doctrine of Elementary Language, which is unfolded in this Work, will alone enable us to discover its existence, and to pursue its operations, through all the intricacies in which it is involved. When the mind has once delivered itself from the guidance of reason, and is no longer solicitous to form those combinations, which are suggested by the evidence or the deductions of truth, it is marvellous to observe, with what rapidity it proceeds from folly to folly, and how fertile it is in inventions to confound and pervert its own faculties; though it is oftentimes totally unconscious

unconscious of the process, by which these effects have been produced. The Jingle of similar sounds has been always regarded as possessing strange powers of fascination even on the best regulated minds; and we may appeal to the properties of alliteration and rhyme, as a most striking though familiar example of this unquestionable fact. Let us extend our views to other modes of action, under the influence of the same principle, and consider the operation of similar sounds conveying dissimilar ideas; when it is exerted on a mind, already occupied in the combination of images, the most wild and marvellous and remote. We may well imagine, what strange and discordant forms would be generated by such a process; and we shall not wonder to discover, that from this source have been derived the most absurd or monstrous of those fictions, which are to be found in the inventions of Mythology.

CHAP. II.

SECT. I.

^R.---C, D, G, &c.

Words denoting the Base *or* Foundation, *&c., as of the* EARTH, ERDE, ARK, ARG, *&c. &c. on which things are* Established—Set—Placed, *&c.—From the idea of the* Foundation, *as the* Main—Chief *and* Principal *Support, or* First *Source of any thing; Terms signifying what is* First *or* Fundamental,—Chief *or* Principal *in Power, Command, Authority, &c., as* ARCHE, (Αρχη, *Fundamentum, Principatus, Imperium.)——Words signifying to* Place *or* Set *out in* ORDer, *as on—in or from their Proper Base or Place—or their* First—ORIGINAL *Situation, as* ORDO, *(Lat.) &c. From the sense of the* Base *or* Foundation, *as suggesting the idea of the* First *part or* Extreme *part; Terms denoting the* Extremity *or the* Top *of any thing, as the* Top *or Point of a Weapon, &c., as* ORD, *(Sax.) Initium, Acies, Cuspis, Apex.*

ARCHE. (Gr.) The Base, Foundation:—Principal Power.
ORIGO, ORIG*inis*. (Lat.) The
ORIGIN. (Eng.) The Base, or first Beginning of any thing.
ORDO. (Lat.) A Beginning,
ORDER. (Eng.) &c.
ORDIOR. (Lat) To Begin, Set in *Order*.
ORDINO. (Lat.) To Set in *Order*, as from a Beginning, To
ORDAIN. (Eng.) &c.
URDD, EURDD, ORD. (Celtic,) *Order*.
ARDEN. (Gr.) Funditus:—From the Base or Foundation; Wholly.
ORD. (Old Eng.) Initium, Acies, Mucro.
ARDIS. (Gr.) The point of a Weapon.
ORD. (Sax.) Initium, *Origo*, Acies, Acumen, Cuspis, Apex.
ORD-*Fruma*. (Sax.) Principium, Initium, *Origo*;—Princeps, Præcipuus.
ARCH, ARCHI, ARCE, ERZ, &c. (Eng. & Fr. Ital. Sax. Germ.) The Chief.
ARCH-*Bishop*, &c. &c.
ERST, ÆREST, &c. (Eng. Germ. Sax. &c.) The *First*.
EARS — ARSCH, AERS, ARTZ, ORROS, quasi ORSOS, &c. (Sax. German, Belg. Dan. Greek, &c.) Fundamentum, Podex.
ARCHOS. (Gr.) Podex, Princeps.

ORDIOR. (Lat.) To Weave, i. e. To arrange a work in *Order*, as from a Beginning.
OURDIR — ORDIRE. (Fr. Ital.) To Weave.
OURT. (Old Eng.) Close Woven.
ARS. (Syriac and Samaritan,) Princeps, Caput, Basis, Fundamentum.
URUK. (Arab.) Roots, *Origins*.
ARD. (Arab.) The *Base* of a Hill, &c.
IRS. (Arab.) *Heritage*, a Root, Stability.
ARZ. (Heb.) The Cedar, from being Firmly Rooted.
ARZ. (Arab.) The Pine:—Firmly Rooted:—A Chief, Leader, &c.

IN the preceding Chapter I considered those terms, belonging to the Element ^R. ^.---C, D, G, &c., which related to the EARTH, under the idea of the *Appropriate* and *Peculiar* Spot—as *Secured* by *Enclosures*—*Fences*, &c.; and which from hence signified *Fences* and *Enclosures* of various kinds and for various purposes, —*Security*—*Defence*, &c. &c. &c. I shall in this Chapter consider those terms, belonging to our Element, which relate to the EARTH, under the idea of the *Base* or *Foundation*, on which things are *Established*—*Set* or *Placed*—from which they arise, and on which they depend, &c. &c. We shall all agree, that ideas of this kind would be most naturally and obviously derived from the name of the EARTH or *Ground*. The very term *Ground*, we know, has this signification of the *Base* or *Foundation*;—the *Ground*-work of any thing; and in the metaphorical application, "The *Ground* of an opinion—the *Grounds* of an argument," we perceive to what remote purposes the name of the EARTH may be applied.—We should be inclined to smile, perhaps, when we first heard of a metaphorical application of this kind,—"The "EARTH of an opinion" and "the EARTHS of an argument;" and we might be disposed probably to consider the writer, who should propose to us such a source for the origin of such metaphors, as the supporter of a visionary hypothesis; if perchance it did not occur to us in the example of *Ground*, that this metaphor was the most obvious and familiar, with which we are acquainted. This single example is sufficient to shew us what difficulties the writer has to encounter, when the original meaning of words has been lost, and the metaphorical sense only remains. It unfortunately happens, that the term EARTH does not supply us with any striking and acknowledged metaphorical applications of this sort; though that defect is supplied by the various senses, which are affixed to *Ground*.—The term *Grounds* is applied to that which *Settles* at the *Ground* or *Bottom* of any thing, as

"Tea-

" Tea-*Grounds*," where we should be again startled at a similar combination of " Tea-EARTHS." *Ground* has been made a verb, signifying To *Establish* or *Found*, " He *Grounds* his title to the " throne;" where " He EARTHS his title to the throne," which is a similar metaphor, would appear to us a strange combination. The Latin *Fundus*, the *Ground*, passes likewise into similar metaphorical applications of the " *Foundation—Bottom—the Chief* " *Author of a thing*," &c., and supplies a verb, as we know, *Fundo*, " To Found, To lay the *Ground* work of a thing," of the same species. I have thought it necessary to detail this obvious and familiar metaphor in acknowledged instances, as it is marvellous to observe, how repugnant and almost alarmed the mind is to admit metaphorical applications precisely of the same or of a similar sort, when they are connected with a term, to which such metaphors have not been manifestly and familiarly annexed. —Nay, even in those acknowledged instances, as " The *Grounds* " of an argument," the mind has so removed itself from the original idea of the word, that it is almost surprized, when it is taught to recollect, that the "*Grounds* of an argument" are derived from the *Ground* on which we walk.—These observations may serve to open the mind of the Reader for the admission of those various metaphorical applications, which he will find unfolded in the succeeding discussions, and which I have conceived to be derived originally from the EARTH, or *Ground*.

This Chapter will be divided into three Sections; and the Reader will find in their due places the various senses, which I have conceived to be derived from the EARTH, or EARTH, &c. &c., as the *Base* or *Foundation*. In the first Section I shall consider the terms, which are found under the form of ^R.---C, D, G, &c., as ARCHE, (Αρχη, Fundamentum,) ORIGO, &c. In the second Section I shall consider the race of words which appear under the form ^.---C, D, G, &c., when the *r* is not visible; as ESTIA,

(Εστια,

(Εστια, Focus, Iar; — Vesta, Dea; — Sedes, &c.), Ezomai, (Εζομαι, Sedeo,) Edos, (Εδος, Sedes; — Firmamentum, Basis,) Istemi, (Ιστημι, Colloco, Statuo, &c. — In Aor. 2. Perf. plusq. perf. Sto, Consisto, unde *Est;* — *Esse* natum, Ortum *Esse,*) &c. &c. We cannot but observe, how the verb of *Existence*, Est, is connected with the sense of Istemi, (Ιστημι,) under the idea of that, which is *Placed — Situated*, &c.; and we shall likewise perceive, that the explanatory term *Existence* from *Ex* and *Sisto*, "To *Set*, to "be made to *Stand*," is attached to the same metaphor. This will open into a wide field of new and interesting investigation; in which the various terms, belonging to our Element ^.--- C, D, G, &c., which denote *Existence — This* or *That* Being—Thing, &c., under whatever name they may be called, — Verbs of Being — Pronouns — Articles — Demonstrative adjectives, &c. &c., as Est, (Lat.) Is, (Eng.) &c. &c., Iste, Hic, Is, Ego, (Lat.) It, (Eng.) &c. &c., with their various derivatives, will be diligently examined and explained. This discussion will form the third Section of the present Chapter, and will unfold, I trust, to the curious and enquiring mind, a view of Languages, which may be considered as totally removed from all former conceptions on the affinities of Human Speech.

I shall now proceed to the consideration of those terms, which I propose to examine in the first Section of this Chapter, under the form ^R. --- C, D, G, &c. We shall all agree, that the term denoting the *Source* or *Origin*, from which any thing springs, or the *Base* or *Foundation*, on which any thing rests, would be naturally derived from the Earth — the *Source* of all vegetable productions, and the *Foundation*, on which every thing is supported. The Greek Arche, (Αρχη, Principium, Exordium, Initium, Fundamentum; — Principatus, Imperium, Dominatus, Magistratus; — Causa, Origo,) is certainly derived from the Aretz, Ark or Earth; and, as I imagine, under the idea of the *Base* or *Foundation.*

dation. The Reader will perceive, that I have exhibited both ideas; the *Source*, as of Vegetable Productions; and the *Base*, or Surface of the EARTH, on which things rest or are upheld. Though these ideas are sometimes distinct from each other, yet in many cases they are so blended, that any attempt to separate them would be vain and fruitless. In the sense of ORIGO we might seem to perceive the idea of the *Source*, as applied to vegetable productions; yet, on considering attentively this word, and the terms with which it is connected; I imagine that ORIGO, the ORIGIN, is derived from the notion of the *Base*, and that it is only another form of ARCHE, (Αρχη.) In a term like this, however, we cannot perhaps separate the idea of the Surface of the EARTH, as the *Base* from that of the *Surface*, as the *Source* of vegetable life. In the Latin *Fundamentum*, from *Fundus*, we see only the idea of the *Ground*, as denoting the *Base;* and nothing presents itself in the meaning of this word, which gives us any notion of the EARTH, as the Source of Vegetable Existence. So in the metaphorical application of the English word *Ground*, "The "*Ground* or Principle of any thing—the *Grounds* of a person's "conduct," we see only the idea of the *Ground*, as applied to the Surface or *Base*. The derivatives of ORIGO appear under the form of the oblique cases, ORIGIN*is*, &c., as *Origin*, (Eng.) *Origine*, (Ital. Fr.) &c., where the *n* is an organical addition to the G. The Etymologists derive ORIGO from *Orior*, which they refer to Ορω, Excito. The Latin *Orior* should be considered as belonging to our Element ^RT, and the true form of it is to be seen in ORT*us*.

In the adjacent word ORD*ior*, "To begin," we see the same idea, as in ORIGO, "The beginning;" and we must acknowledge, I imagine, that they belong to each other. They coincide, moreover, with the sense of *Orior*, ORT*us*, "To be made, to have "a *beginning*," as Robert Ainsworth explains it. Another adjacent word,

word, ORDO, ORDER, likewise means a *Beginning;* and thus we see, that all these terms agree with each other in the same leading idea. ORDO is explained by R. Ainsworth, " An ORDER, or Law " of Nature;—A *Beginning*, series, tenor, and succession of time " or things; An established Rule, or Law." ORDINO means likewise " To set in ORDER, To set or plant in Rows—To " ORDAIN." The term ORDIOR in the first sense, as given by R. Ainsworth, is " To *Begin;* properly To Spin or Weave.— " Aranea *Orditur* telas;" and in the next sense it means " To " Decree, or *Ordain.*" From hence too we may learn, that the meanings of these words accord with each other. The primary idea, annexed to the terms before us, is To *Place* or *Set*, as on a certain *Base*, or *Fundamental* Position—To EARTH. In short, I imagine that these words denote EARTH—*Place*, or *Position*, with the idea of the *First—Fundamental* Place, from which things *Begin*, and on which they are Founded—Established—or *Set*. The word *Set*, we know, is attached to the sense of *Sedes*, the certain Place, or *Situation;* and this brings us at once to the idea of *Arrangement—Regulation*, ORDER, or, as we express it, of *Setting* things in ORDER. This union of *Set* and ORDER will explain my hypothesis with sufficient accuracy, as I conceive, that ORDER in its primitive sense had nearly the same meaning as *Set*. I shall shew, that *Set* belongs to the Element ST, denoting the Ground.

Thus then ORDO, ORD*ino*, ORD*ior*, ORD*ering*, &c., as relating to the Arrangement of things, mean nothing but EARTH*ing*, or Situating, and *Setting* things in or on their proper EARTHS, their due *Established Places*, or ORTE, (German,) or their appropriate ORIGINAL *Situations*.—In the same column of my German Lexicon, where ORT, *Place*, is, we have *Ordnung*, ORD*er*. If ORD*nung* had been written ORT*nung*, we should have had no doubt, that ORT*nung* signified *Placing;* and if they both had been

been written ERT, *Ertnung*, or ERD, ERD*nung*, we should have understood, that they meant the ERDE, the EARTH, the Place, or *Situation*, and ERD-*ing*, or EARTH-*ing*, *Placing*, *Setting*, &c. When ORDO, ORD*ior*, ORIGO, denote *Beginning*, they convey the idea of the EARTH—as the *First Fundamental Place*, the ORIGINAL *Spot*, on which things are *Set*, and from which they *Begin* or are *Set* off, if I may so express it. The phrase *Set* off, (if we consider its primitive sense, and remove from it the notion of departure,) expresses this combination of ideas as nearly as it can be conveyed; and if ORD*ior* were explained in the first sense by To *Set* off, To Begin, *Orditur loqui*, He *Sets* off speaking, and in the next sense, To *Set* in ORDER, the genuine idea of the word would be expressed with as much accuracy as language will admit. *Set* agrees with the race of words before us, as it relates to what is Established in a certain Place; but it does not convey so strongly the idea of the *Fundamental* or ORIGINAL Place. R. Ainsworth explains ORDO in the second sense by "A beginning, series, tenor, and succession, of time, or things," where we see the genuine sense of a *Set* of things Placed in ORDER, as from or on some Base or ORIGINAL *Situation*. It is marvellous to observe, how aptly words are adopted, from a strong impression of their primitive turn of meaning. ORDER is brought to its primitive idea, when it is applied to the *Placing* or Arranging of Parts in an Object, *Established on a Base*, as in the ORDERS of *Architecture*. Let us mark the word ARCH*itecture*, which we know is derived from the same idea, and, as we now see, from the same race of words, the ARCHE, (Αρχη, Fundamentum,) the Base, or Foundation; and thus we understand, how, by a just feeling of the mind respecting the primitive sense of these words, they are again brought in union with each other.

Before I quit these terms, ORDE, &c., I should observe, that if

if the sense of ORDO had not been manifestly connected with the idea of ORIGIN or *Beginning*, as referring to the EARTH, under the notion of the *Base* or *Foundation*; I should have referred it to the same spot, under another meaning.—We might have supposed, that ORDO belonged to the EARTH, under the idea of *Furrows*, made in regular rows; and we shall find, that words with such a meaning are often derived from this source. In modern Greek, a Furrow is ORD*inion*, (Ορδινιον) a term preserved by the Scholiast on Theocritus. "Αυλακα δε, τον Ογμον φησι, το "κοινως λεγομενον ΟΡΔΙΝΙΟΝ." In Welsh, URDD is "An ORDER, "state, or degree," as Mr. Richards explains it; who quotes the parallel Armoric word EURDD. In Mr. Shaw's Galic and Irish Dictionary we have ORD, "An ORDER, Series;" ORD*uigham*, "To ORDER, set in ORDER, ORDAIN." In the same column of Mr. Shaw's Dictionary we have ORDA, "A piece, fragment," which belongs to the German and English ORT, originally denoting a certain Place—or certain Piece or Part of EARTH. Thus we see, how ORD and ORDA coincide with each other, as the one relates to a *Place* or *Part*, and the other to the idea of *Placing*—Arranging, &c. I find adjacent to these words, in Mr. Shaw's Dictionary, ORD, "A Hammer, Mallet," and ORDIN, a Mallet, which may directly belong to ORDA, "A Piece, "Fragment," as the Instrument, which breaks things into Pieces; or it may belong to a race of words denoting violence of action, as HURT, HARD, &c. &c. It is not necessary to produce the terms in Modern Languages, belonging to ORDO, ORDINO, which every one acknowledges, *Ordre*, *Ordonner*, (Fr.) &c. &c. The *n* in ORD*inis*, ORD*ino*, &c. is an organical addition to the *D*, as it is to the *G* in ORIG*in*, &c.

ORD, ORDURE, ARDA. (French, Eng. Gr.) Filth, or Dirt, as of the *Earth*.

ARDO. (Gr.) Rigo, Irrigo, perhaps, originally, To Dawb, or Splash, as with Dirt; then To Splash, Sprinkle in general, as with Water, &c.

ORDAN*ion*, (Gr.) An *Earthen* vessel.

JORDAN, or JURDEN. (Eng.) Matula, an *Earthen* vessel.

WHILE I am examining these words in the Dictionaries of Modern Languages, I cast my eyes on ORD*ure*, (Eng. and Fr.) Filth, Dung, which we now see denotes the Dirt of the EARTH. Skinner refers ORD*ure* to the French word, under the same form, — the Italian *Ordura*, and the old French word *Ord*, Sordidus; and he derives them all from *Sordes*, "rejecto sibilo." Junius produces the Greek ARDA, Αρδα, which Hesychius explains by Μολυσμος, Inquinamentum. Junius likewise gives us, as the parallel Italian term, *Lordezza*, which Lye derives from the Islandic *Lort*. These Lexicographers might have produced the Italian *Lordura*, from which Skinner has by mistake got his *Ordura*.—*Lordura* has only an accidental coincidence with *Ordure*. This word and *Lordezza* belong to *Lordo*, Foul, and to *Lort*, (Island.) as Lye supposes, to the French *Laid*, the Latin *Lutum*, &c. The French Etymologists derive ORD from *Olidus*. While I am examining this term in Menage, I cast my eyes on another old French word, ORCE, which signifies 'The Sides of a Ship,' where we have the idea of the ERK-*os*, (Ερκος,) the *Enclosing* boundary. To the Greek ARDA, (Αρδα,) Filth, should perhaps be directly referred another Greek word, ARDO, (Αρδω, Rigo, Irrigo; — Potum præbeo, Adaquo,) which in its original sense might signify "*To be-foul, be-daub, be-spatter, be-splash,*" and then

then To Throw or *Splash* Water over, or To Water in general, Αρδειν τους κηπους, ἱππον. The Greek Φυρω has this double sense of To Dawb and To Sprinkle, Φυρω, Inquino, Fœdo, Perfundo, Rigo. In *Ardmos*, and *Ardethmos*, (Αρδμος, Αρδηθμος, Irrigatio,) I cannot decide, whether the DM, TM, be a significant addition, belonging to *DM*, the Ground. An adjacent term to ARDO, (Αρδω,) is ARD*is*, (Αρδις, Cuspis teli; — Arma, quibus cominus pugnabant,) the Point or Top of a Weapon, which on the first view appears very different to the origin of *Ardo*, (Αρδω:) yet a little reflection will at once explain this difficulty. ARD*is*, (Αρδις,) as denoting the Point or Top of a Weapon, must be referred to the ERDE, the EARTH, under the idea of the *Surface* or Top; and thus it coincides with the words produced above, ORDIOR, &c. The Surface of the EARTH under one idea is the *Top*, and under another the *Base* or *Bottom*.

To ARD*is*, (Αρδις, Cuspis Teli,) we must refer the old English term ORD, "Acies, mucro, cuspis, [initium,]" as it is explained in Lye's Edition of Junius. The latter produces the line in Chaucer, "He sticketh him upon his speres ORDE." The Etymologists justly refer us to the Saxon ORD, where we unequivocally see, how ARD*is*, (Αρδις,) is connected with ORD*ior*, ORIGO, &c. Lye explains ORD by "Initium, ORIGO, &c. Item Acies, Acumen, "cuspis,—Apex." An adjacent word is ORD-*Fruma*, "Principium, "Initium, ORIGO,—Auctor.—Item Princeps, Præcipuus." In the sense of *Princeps* we are brought to the idea expressed by ARCHE, (Αρχη, Principium.) Lye has another article, "*Or*, ORD. "Cimbr. *Ar* et ARD, Initium, Principium, ORIGO, Auctor." Lye produces the following passages from Chaucer: "That of "this story written ORD and End;"—"Of this broch he told "him ORD and End." We perceive, that OR and AR belong to ORD and ARD; and hence we shall understand, that OR*ior* is attached to the race of words now before us. The sound of the

R is

R is frequently connected with that of *S*. In Greek, we know, *Arren* and *Arsen*, (Αρρην and Αρσην,) are both written; and in the ancient form of the Latin Language, many words now written with *R* appeared with *S*, as *Ara* was written *Asa; Ero, Eso*, &c. &c. In Mr. Shaw's Galic and Irish Dictionary we have Odh. "The point of a Spear, sharp end of any thing," where the sound of *r* in Or*D*, Mucro, &c. is lost.

That I have given the just idea respecting the derivation of Ard*is*, (Αρδις,) will be evident from the term preceding it, which actually denotes the *Base;*—Ard*en*, (Αρδην, *Funditus*, plane, omnino,) 'From the *Base* or *Foundation*, Altogether, Entirely, &c.' This the Etymologists derive from Αιρω, Tollo. An adjacent term is Ard*anion*, (Αρδανιον, Vas fictile;—Vas ex quo pecudes bibunt;—Vas quod ante fores defunctorum ponebatur, ut ex eo se adspergerent introeuntes,) which the Lexicographers derive from *Ardo*, (Αρδω, Irrigo,) because it was a Vessel used for Water. This perhaps may be so; yet the genuine meaning of the word Ardan*ion*, (Αρδανιον, Vas fictile,) may possibly be contained in its first sense, and denote literally the Earthen Vessel. The Jordan or Jurden, Matula, seems to mean only the Earthen Vessel. We have seen the Danish names for the Earth under the forms of Jord, Jorden. Skinner derives *Jordan* from *Gor*, Stercus, and *Den*, Cubile, "et secundario quodvis receptaculum, "q. d. Gr. Σκατοδοχειον." The same Lexicographer thinks it necessary to inform his readers, that it is not derived, "ut primâ fronte "videri possit, à *Jordane* fluvio, q. d. Urinæ alveus."

The English word Arch, as Arch-*Bishop*, &c., belongs, we know, to Arche, (Αρχη,) &c. The term is applied likewise to bad and ludicrous objects, &c., which are eminent in their kind, as 'Arch Rogue,' and 'Arch Fellow.' Junius has produced the parallel terms in other Languages, as *Arch*, (Fr.) *Archi, Arc*, or *Arci*, &c. (Ital. Span.) *Arts*, (Belgic,) *Ærce, Arce, Erce*, (Sax.); and

and he might have added the German *Erz*, &c. &c. I shall not attempt to produce the acknowledged derivatives of *Arche*, (Αρχη,) which every where abound, as *Archives*, the ORIGINAL—Fundamental—Authentic place for preserving records, &c., *Architrave*, *Architecture*, &c. &c. In Mr. Shaw's Galic and Irish Dictionary, ARD is used for ARCH, as ARD-*Easbuig*, *Arch*-Bishop, ARD-*Aingal*, *Arch*-Angel; but whether it should be considered, as directly belonging to ARCH and its parallels, I cannot decide. ARD means "High, Lofty, Eminent, Excellent;" and AIRDE likewise means "Height, Eminence, Highness." The term AIRDE is adjacent to AIRD, "A Coast, quarter, cardinal point," which I have shewn to mean the certain Spot or EARTH. As AIRD denotes a Cardinal Point by way of distinction, for 'The Coast, 'or Quarter,' so AIRDE may mean the EARTH, or Spot by way of distinction, or the *High*—the *Elevated* Spot; or it might denote the EARTH, the *Top*, or Surface of the EARTH, in which sense it would coincide with the turn of meaning annexed to ARCHE, (Αρχη.) In these coincidences it is impossible to decide, without full evidence, respecting the original meaning of the word. I shall not attempt to produce the various terms in Irish and Galic belonging to these words AIRDE, ARD, which denote what is *High*—Great, Eminent, or Illustrious, as *Aird-chur*, Power, *Ard-Riogh*, "A Monarch," *Airdgheoin*, "Great Noise, "Tempest, Hurricane," &c. &c. In the same column of Mr. Shaw's Dictionary we have "*Aireach*. Noble, a noble person," which is probably from "Aire. A name to the different ranks of Nobility;" but *Aire* itself belongs to the Elements ^RS.

In Mr. Shaw's Galic and Irish Dictionary we have EIRG*am*, "To Arise, pass, advance," and EIRIGH, A Viceroy, Chief "Governor," where we have the two senses of ARCHO, (Αρχω, Incipio, Initium facio;—Principium, Auctor, vel Origo sum;—Principatum obtineo, impero, dominor, præsum,) the *Foundation*,

ORIGIN,

ORIGIN, from which things *Arise*, and on which they are supported, and the *Principal* or *Chief*, in general, as to power, command, authority, &c. In the same column of Mr. Shaw's Dictionary we have EIRIS, "An Æra, an Account of Time," which may mean the point of Time, from which things Commence; or the *Duration* of Time, that which *Lasts*, or *Endures*, as things Placed on a firm *Foundation*, &c. *Æra* probably belongs to it, which I have considered in another place. In the same column of Mr. Shaw's Dictionary we have EIRS*am*, To Arise, and the preceding term is EIRRSCE, "A Trunk, stump," which means the *Base* or *Foundation*. In Welsh, ARCH*afael* is "To Ascend, to Exalt, to Rise, or Lift up," and *Dyrchafael* has a similar meaning, "An Ascending, a going up," &c. In the same column of Mr. Richards' Welsh Dictionary we have ARCH, a Chief, as in *Archesgob*, An ARCH-BISHOP; and I find in the same column ARCH*en*, "Clothing, Apparel. It seems to signify "properly a Shoe, Patten, or any thing worn on the Foot." If the original idea of the word was that of something covering the *Foot*, it might be considered as the part treading on the *Base* or Surface of the EARTH; and from thence it was applied to a covering for other parts: Yet it may mean the *Enclosure*, and belong to a word in the preceding column, ARCH, "A Chest, a Coffer"—An ARK; as I have conjectured in another place.

The term *Admiral*, which has so much embarrassed the Etymologists, might possibly be referred to this race of words, ARD. High, &c. It occurs in various Languages, as in the Italian *Ammiraglio*, the Spanish *Almirante*, the German *Ammiral*, the Belgic *Ammirael*, the French *Admiral* or *Amiral*, the Modern Greek Αμηραλιος, &c. &c.; and is derived by some from the Arabic *Emir*, Dominus—by others from *Emir* and Αλιος, Marinus,—from the German *Ampt*, Munus, *Meer*, *Mare*, and *All*, Totus, &c. &c. &c.

This

This is a word of great difficulty. It should certainly seem on the first view as if *Mare*, or its parallel words *Meer*, &c. were a part of the composition. When we learn, however, what the French Etymologists have unequivocally proved, that *Admiral* meant originally *Chief* or *Governour* in general, and not the Chief at Sea, this idea must be abandoned. It certainly seems, as the French Critics suppose, as if the word came to us from the East in the time of the Crusades, and that it is taken from the Arabic *Emir*. In this opinion we should probably rest; yet it ought to be observed, what no Etymologist has noticed, that in the Galic and Irish Dialects of the Celtic we have "ARDMHAIR*ach*, "An Admiral," where surely the *Ardmhair* belongs to *Admir* in *Admir-al*; and the ARD, whatever might be the origin, was certainly intended to belong to ARD, High, &c. I state my position in these words, because, if the Galic *Ardmhair* belongs to *Admir*, and was recently introduced from it into the Celtic Dialects, the form of ARD in *Ardmhair* was assuredly adopted by the introducer of the word, that it might coincide with *Ard*, signifying High. But there seems in this Celtic term to be another significant portion. The *Mhair* was intended to express nearly the same as *Ard*, and to belong to MOR, (Gal.) "Great, "Noble." The Element MR has the same meaning through the whole compass of Language, and hence we have the Arabic term *Emir*. In Galic we find a compound of this Element MR, as *Mormhaor*, "A Lord Mayor, High Steward, an Earl, Lord." In Welsh, *Maer* is "A Mayor, Provost," &c. Hence is derived our Surname *Moore*, and the English term for Greatness or Abundance, *More*. Hence we have *Maro*, and *Homer*, which is nothing but *Emir*. The *Omer-os*, (Ομηρος, Obses,) the Hostage, is still the *Emir*, or Illustrious personage, given up as a Security.

ARD, in the Persian ARDE*shir*, from which the Greeks have formed with great precision their term ARTA*xerxes*, (Αρταξερξης,) means

means ARD, *High*. The name *Arthur* might be a word of the same kind, though it perhaps belongs to the Welsh *Aruthr*, Wonderful, which is a compound of *Ar* and *Uthr*, bearing the same meaning. The formation of this term *Artaxerxes* by the Greeks has been the subject of cavil; yet no word, passing from one Language to another, has been more faithfully recorded. Nothing can be expected or be performed in point of minuteness, but to preserve a record of the word by adopting cognate Consonants. In the representation ARDE*shir* no more has been or can be accomplished. The ARDE corresponds with the Αρτα, ARTA, of the Greek; and the *Shir* is the *Xer* or *k*SER; so that ARDE-*Shir* is ARTA-*kser*. The *Es*, we know, is the Greek termination. The *X* or *KS* after the *R* seems to have been a sound annexed to *R*, which to a Grecian ear resembled that at the beginning of the syllable or word KSER, quasi KSER-*ks*. The sound of *S* is perpetually connected with R. Hence it has arisen, that *R* and *S* are adjacent to each other in the Alphabet. The words in the present form of the Latin Language, which are written with R, were anciently written with *S*, as *Ara*, *Asa*, *Ero*, *Eso*; and in Greek, we know, *Arren* and *Arsen*, (Αρρην, Αρσην,) are used for each other. In the modern Persian alphabet, adopted from the Arabs, the letters R and Z are adjacent to each other, and the characters, by which they are represented, are the same, except that one of these letters has a dot prefixed to it, ر r, ز z.—The *Shir* and *Kser* in these words belong, I imagine, to *Sir*, *Sire*, *Czar*, KUR-*ios*, (Κυριος,) &c. &c. The name XER-*xes* is XER*x*-*es* in *Arta*-XER*x*-*es*, without the Epithet ARTA. Mr. Richardson observes, that *Arde-Shir* was called *Bahaman*. The term *Bahaman* is a compound, bearing the same meaning, from *Baha*, or *Bahar*, Great, and *Man*, corresponding with our term *Man*, the Illustrious Being. The DAR in DAR-*ius* is only another form of *Shir*, *Xer*, $\overline{\text{DS}}$ R. Mr. Richardson has

has observed, that *Dara* is synonymous with *Sha*, and signifies in Persian a King; though he makes *Darab* to mean, Possessed by or found on Water. He attributes these two names, *Dara* and *Darab*, to the King, who reigned before the Prince, called by the Greeks *Darius Codomannus*; and he produces a narrative recorded by the Persian Historians, to illustrate the origin of this name. We cannot doubt that the *Dara* means the same in both these words, whatever real or pretended story the Persian Historians may produce to confirm this Etymological conjecture respecting the name of *Darab*. The *Sha* شه in Modern Persian for a King, is quasi *Shar*, corresponding with *Dar*, *Dara*.

Another Persian word for a King, as a Royal Surname, is خسرو *Ksru*; which is commonly represented by *Khosrou*, with the breathing between the *K* and *S*, but which I consider to be quasi *Ksoru*, and to belong to the Element SR. In the name CYAXER-*es*, which is meant to represent *Chosrou*, we see the breathing before the *R* preserved. In *Ahasuerus* or *Achasuerus*, as it is sometimes, and as it ought to be represented, we see in *Chasuer*—the *Cyaxer* and the *Chosrou*. Whether the *Ac* be quasi *Arc* or *Ard*, I cannot decide. In the name of CYR*us*, the CYR still represents the XER, *Shir*, &c. The sound of *s*, which I conceive to be annexed to R, seems to shew itself in *Cyrus* or *Kuros*, (Κυρος;) as the addition of the *s* appears to have been intended to represent the name, though the form *os* was adopted for the purpose of complying with the analogy of the Greek Language, and the *s* was afterwards dropt for the same reason. The mode, in which this name is commonly expressed, is *Coresh*; and Isaiah represents it by כורש CURS, where we unequivocally see the *s* expressed. We see likewise the *s* annexed to the R in the name *Achasuerus*, אחשורוש AC*h*SURUS. The *Chsurus*, in this Hebrew or Chaldaic representation, precisely, we see, coincides with the Greek *Kuros*, (Κυρος.) *Chosrou* is likewise often

represented by *Chosroes*. We now understand, that the Greeks had good cause for adding their *x* or *ks* to the R in Xerx-*es* or Kserks-*es*; and that their *Xrx*, *Ksrks*, or *Csrcs*, is a just representation of the Hebrew *Crs* in *Curs*, the Chaldee *Chsrs* in *Chsurus;* as likewise of the *Crsh* in *Coresh*, the *Chsrs* in *Chosroes*, and of the *Krs* or *Crs* in *Kuros*, (Κυρος,) and *Cyrus*. Nothing therefore can be more intelligible and consistent than the process, by which this apparent variety has been produced. Let us imagine, that the Elementary form is $\overline{\text{KS}}$, $\overline{\text{DS}}$, S, &c. } R-*s;* that the *s* succeeding the *R* is an organical addition, which sometimes appears; and that a vowel breathing is sometimes inserted between the symbols representing the first letter of the Radical, as likewise between the *R* and the organical *s*.

The Chronologists find great difficulty in adjusting the æras, in which the Princes under these names lived, and in reconciling their history with the Persian records. The Sacred Writers, as well as the Grecian Historians, have been condemned for their negligence or perversion in their account of these Princes. We shall now understand, from this view of the question, without discussing the nature of the Historical facts, how these apparent incongruities may have arisen. First we must observe, that all these names are to be referred to the same origin; —secondly, that some of them are Royal titles, common to different persons, as Czar, a term belonging to the race, at present actually is; and thirdly, that others of them are names, applied to particular persons. Now, as long as these names, thus related to each other, remain in a Language well understood, under the same characters; their different forms, arising from different vowels and from different Cognate Consonants, distinguished from each other by different symbols uniformly applied to the same purpose, will be sufficient to mark out with all due precision the different offices, which they were intended to execute. But when these

names

names pass into other Languages and Characters, and have undergone the process of change annexed to this operation, the record only of their affinity remains to the eye of the Etymologist; while the distinctions, which marked their difference, have been obliterated. Thus the forms of *Sir*, *Sire*, and *Czar*, are fully sufficient to distinguish, in a Language well understood, the different offices, which they are intended to execute; but under any other representation, Σερος, Σειρος, Ξαρος, or when again brought into the same characters, *Seros*, *Seiros*, *Zaros*, *Xaros*, or *Ksaros*, we are no longer able to discover the different personages, or titles of respect, which these terms originally marked and designated. If *Sir* and *Sire* represented the names of two successive Kings, we should not be able to discover, in the representation *Seros*, *Seiros*, &c., which of these Kings was intended. Nothing can decide on this point, but the coincidence of the Historical facts, which belong to each of these Personages. In a word, if a race of Kings are represented by the same Elementary characters, expressing either the names of Individuals, or used as common Titles, we cannot determine, when these names are represented in other Languages and under other Characters, to which of these Kings the names thus represented are to be referred, unless from the most accurate knowledge of the particular Histories, connected with their lives.

On the whole we may observe, that it would betray in us no inconsiderable degree of presumption and ignorance, if we should proceed to charge with negligence and perversion writers of good name and credit, who may appear to have confounded Persons and events; unless we are fully possessed with the nature of these Etymological difficulties, and unless we are amply provided with the means of acquiring Historical information in the most minute particulars; from which alone, in many cases, the identity of Persons can be decided.—These observations on the different forms,

forms, which names assume, will be found of considerable importance in various parts of our Etymological Enquiries; and they will operate, I trust, in correcting that vulgar error, so familiar and inveterate even among the most enlightened Scholars, which persists in repeating, that the Greeks have been the great confounders and corrupters of names.—The Greeks have in general performed all, which the nature of the case would permit. They have retained the Cognate Consonants, which are sufficient to preserve the record of the Person intended, when no difficulty arises from different names under the same Elementary characters. They have not done more, indeed, than other nations have done; but they have performed their duty with equal accuracy, and their labours have been more extensive and important. It is marvellous to observe, with what accuracy and precision the record of Names, or, I might say, of Human Speech in general, has been preserved in the symbolical representation of letters, not only among those, who have recorded their own Language, but even by those, who have recorded words belonging to other Languages, totally dissimilar in form and character.

We have seen, that AIRD-*gheoin* means "Great noise, tem-" pest, *Hurricane.*" Let us mark the explanatory word *Hurricane*, which belongs to the French *Houragan*, or *Ouragan*. The French Etymologists suppose, that *Ouragan*, *Huracan*, (Span.) is a term in the Language of the Natives of *Havanna*, *Jamaica*, &c. This might be the fact; and yet it might still belong to the Celtic *Airdgheoin*. The word however is not related to its original term through so remote a medium. The succeeding word to AIRD, in Mr. Shaw's Dictionary, is AIRD, "State, order, "improvement;" and the next is AIRD, "Happiness," which no doubt are attached to each other. AIRD, ORDER, belongs, we see, to the race of words which I have before examined. The succeeding term is *Airdbheandham*, To Cut, which I must leave the

the Celtic Scholar with this clue before him to explain. The terms for *Cutting* are commonly derived from the operation of Cutting the Ground in Ploughing, &c., as *Tailler* belongs to *Tellus*, &c. &c. AIRD in this verb might belong to AIRD, "A coast, quarter," &c., under the idea of a *Part*—To divide into *Parts*. The Latin ARD*uus*, denoting *High*, might belong to the Celtic ARD, "High, Lofty," &c.; yet it may be attached to HARD, HARSH, as denoting that, which is HARD or Difficult to ascend. ARD*uus* is explained by Robert Ainsworth, "Inac-"cessible, High, Lofty, Steep—HARD, Troublesome, Difficult," &c. &c. ARD*uus* is referred by the Etymologists to ARD*eo;* and they belong to each other, though with somewhat of a different turn of meaning, as I shew in another place.

We shall now understand, that our ancient term ERST must be referred to this race of words. The Etymologists remind us of *Ere*, and refer us likewise to the Saxon *Ærista*, Primus, and the German *Erist*. In modern German it is written ERSTE, the *First;* and in Saxon we have various forms of this word, as ÆRST, ÆREST, ÆROST, ÆRTHON, &c. Adjacent to these words we have *Ærr*, *Ærra*, Prior, ÆRS, Anus, Podex. We have likewise ÆREST, Resurrectio. This will remind us of our word ARISE, which may mean either To come forward, as from a Base—a *First* or ORIGINAL Source, or it may be derived from the idea of *Stirring* up the Ground. We know, that *Rise* is another form of *Arise;* and the difficulty is to decide, which form was the primitive one. Under the Element RS we have a race of words, bearing the same meaning, and referring to the same object, as those under ^RS. In old English we have the form ^RS, with a breathing before the R, corresponding with *Ærost*, *Arise*, &c. In the Poems attributed to Rowley, ARIST occurs. The Poet, speaking of a "Welked flourette," or withered flower, says,

"ARIST it blew, itte florished, and dyd welle." (*Eclogue* III. 51.)

The

The flower *Arising* blew and flourished.—The English word *First* or *f*-IRST should probably be considered as only another form of ERST, with the labial breathing *f* added. The Etymologists refer it to the Saxon *First*, the Islandic *Fyrstur*, the Runic *Fyrst*, the Greek *Feristos*, (Φεριστος,) the Danish *Forste*, and the Belgic *Veurst*, *Eerst*, &c., all which they derive from *Fore*, Antea, or *Fuhren*, Ducere, &c. &c.

We shall instantly agree, that our vulgar English word for the lower part of the person, on which we sit, belongs to the idea of the EARTH, as the ARCHE, (Αρχη, Fundamentum,) the *Base;* precisely as *Fundament* does to the *Fundamentum* or *Foundation.* This vulgar term appears in various Languages; as the Saxon *Ears*, the German *Arsch*, the Belgic *Aers*, the Danish *Artz*, which the Etymologists have produced, who refer us moreover to the Greek *Orros*, (Ορρος, pars subjecta testiculis,) and ARCHOS, (Αρχος, Princeps, Dux; — Podex, Intestinum rectum.) The Greek *Orros* is probably quasi ORSOS, as *Arren* and ARSEN (Αρρην, Αρσην,) belong to each other. An adjacent term to this vulgar word in Skinner is *Arseversy*, which he derives from the French *Revers.* It means the bottom or *Fundamental* part, *Versum*, turned upwards; and it has the same meaning, though with an opposite process, as *Topsy Turvy;* where we have the Top thrown to the Bottom or *Turf.* Junius under the same vulgar term produces the Saxon name for a Medlar, corresponding with a gross English name for the same fruit, to which there is an allusion in *Romeo and Juliet*, (A. II. S. 1.) Junius observes, likewise, " Ab eodem quoque *Ars*, compositione non inelegant, " Mergulus Ang. dicitur *Arsfoot*, B. *Aersvoet*, at Cym. Tindroed " nuncupatur, a Tin, Podex, et Droed, Pes: Prorsus ut Πυγοσκελιδα " Græci, Hesychio teste, non modo Mergulum dixere à pedibus " podici junctis, verum etiam brevi atque humili corpore homun- " cionem et paullum supra terram exstantem." — We shall now understand,

understand, that the Greek Ezomai, (Εζομαι,) To sit, is nothing but To EARTH, ERZ, or EZ, To be or be fixed upon the EARTH, as a Base, Seat. Hence EDOS signifies a Base—Foundation, and that which is Fixed or Erected, on a firm Base or Foundation, as a House, Temple, &c., (Εδος, Sedes, sella;—Delubrum, templum, ædes;—Simulacrum;—Firmamentum, Basis.) In EDRA we have another form, and this word likewise signifies *Podex*, for the same reason, (Εδρα, Sella, Sedes;—Basis;—Podex hominis;—Latrina.) In Saxon, HÆRTHAN signifies "Testiculi, pudenda "virilia;" and again, HERTH-*belig* is "Viscus;—i. e. Pellis in "quâ includuntur testiculi. Scrotum, (ab HÆRTHAN, Testiculi, "et *belig*, Venter.)" I shall shew in another Volume, that *Tail* belongs to *Tellus*.

The Lexicographers explain ORDIOR by "To Begin, properly "to Spin or Weave,—Aranea ORDITUR telas." The sense of To *Weave* is derived, I believe, from the idea of Placing in due ORDER the threads. The Etymologists produce under ORDIOR the term in Hesychius, ORDEMA, Ορδημα, which he explains by Η τολυπη των εριων, Lana carpta, et operi parata. To ORDIOR belong the French OURDIR, and the Italian ORDIRE, To Warp, &c. The term OURT occurs in the Poems attributed to Rowley, and seems to be directly connected with OURDIR. In *The Battle of Hastings*, No. 2. William commands his Soldiers to "Dare to "closer fyghte,"

"The Saxonne warryor, that dyd so entwyne,
"Like the neshe bryon and the eglantine,
"Orre Cornish wrastlers at a Hocktyde game.
"The Normannes, all emarchialld in a lyne,
"To the OURT arraie of the thight Saxonnes came."

(Ver. 574. &c.)

Dean Milles strangely explains OURT by "*Out, or Open;*" but we perceive, that the meaning is directly the opposite. The arraie

arraie of the Saxons, says the Poet, set *thick* or close together, was OURT or interwoven, one part with another, like the Briony Entwining with the Eglantine, or like two Wrestlers grappling with each other.

In Hebrew, ארג ARG signifies "To Weave;" and to this Mr. Parkhurst has referred the Greek *Arachne*, (Αραχνη.) The parallel terms to ARACHN*es*, or ARACHNE, (Αραχνης, Araneus, vel Aranea, Αραχνη, Aranea, Tela Aranea,) are the Latin *Aranea*, the French *Araignée*, the Italian *Ragno*, the Spanish *Arana*, &c. Whether these terms belong to the Hebrew word I cannot decide. In another place I have suggested a different source.—I cannot decide, moreover, whether the Hebrew word should be considered as directly attached to ORD*ior*; but we shall not doubt, when we see the terms with which it is connected, that it must be referred to the same spot. In the three succeeding columns of Mr. Parkhurst's Lexicon are the following words: ארח ARC*h*, "To go in a track, and as a N. A common road, "highway, path, a constant course, or settled customary way." ארך ARK. "The idea of this word is *Length*, *Long*,"—ארע ARG, (Chaldee,) ארץ ARZ, (Heb.)—ארק ARK, (Chaldee,) the EARTH, as this Lexicographer has explained them. We perceive, that ארג ARG, To Weave, denotes the regular Courses—*Paths*, (if I may so express it,) or Lengths of the Threads. We cannot but note, that *Trama* has the same relation to *Trames*. We see, that ארח *ARCh* belongs to the Greek ERC*homai*, (Ερχομαι, Eo.)

The succeeding word to these two last Hebrew terms is ארש ARS, which signifies "To *betroth*, or *Espouse*." Castell produces ארש ARS, "Sponsione promisit;" and the preceding word is ארש ARS, ארשת ARST, "Pronunciatum, petitio, pec. "Fundamentalis Præcipua, Principalis," under which he produces, as parallel with the same Radical, the Syriac ARSC*ia*, Monarcha, "Princeps, Primas," and the Samaritan ARS, "Caput, Autor, "Princeps;

"Princeps;—It. *Basis, Fundamentum;*" where, in the sense of the *Base,* or *Foundation,* we are again brought to the race of words, which I am now discussing. The sense of ארש ARS, "To betroth, or espouse," may mean the Firm, Established contract, or the *Foundation* or Beginning of the future Marriage, and afterwards the Marriage itself. Whatever be the union of this word with the EARTH; the terms, with which it is surrounded, will convince us, that such a relation must exist. Castell produces a Chaldee term, ארס ARS, with a final ס S instead of ש S, which he has explained by "Desponsavit;" and here we are brought to the same spot by other senses of the word. One derivative of this word means *Hortulanus,* as he explains it; and another, "Hortorum et agrorum cultura." He likewise produces under this word, as a parallel term, the Arabic ارس ARS, *Aravit.* In Arabic, عروس ARUS means "A Bridegroom," which the Persians have adopted. An Arabic word in the same column of Mr. Richardson's Dictionary, عروض ARUZ, among its various senses, denotes "A way, a track; a border, confine, limit;" where we have the original idea of the word. In the next column we have عروق URUK, "Roots, origins," and عريض ARYZ, "Broad, large, "much." The preceding word to ARYZ is عريش ARISH, "A shade from the sun, an arbour, a bower," which is connected with عرش ARSH, "A Throne, chair of state—The roof of a "House." The sense of the *Roof* and the Throne refers to the *Top*—High Situation; and the *Arbour* is probably the *Roofed* or Shaded Place. These points, however, must be adjusted by the Arabic Scholar, from a diligent enquiry into the peculiar meaning of the word. In the same column, there is another Arabic term, under our Radical ^RZ, عرض AREZ, which has a great variety of senses, and which the adepts in that Language must likewise reconcile with the original notion, whatever it may be. I must observe, however, that among other senses, it means

" Breadth, amplitude, width.—A Side, a tract, confine, border, " extremity.—The Foot or *Base* of a Mountain." In the same column we have likewise the Arabic عرض ARD, ARID, URID, " 1. The *Basis* of a hill. 2. Hard, stiff, (penis.)" The same Arabic word IRS ارث which means " *Inheritance, Heritage, Hereditary* " right," and which I have supposed to signify the Possessor of EARTH or Land, means likewise " A Root, stability, the principal, " any thing agreeable to ancient *Hereditary* Custom.—Ashes, " the Remains, Residue;" which belongs to the EARTH, under the idea of the *Base* or *Foundation*, and not under the notion of *Hereditary* Custom. The *Ashes* may mean the dirt of the EARTH, or what lies upon the HEARTH, EARTH, or Ground. The Arabic term AREZ عرض denoting *Breadth*, and the Hebrew ארך ARK, *Long*, will remind us of the Greek EURUS, (Ευρυς, Latus.)

Another Greek word, OREGO, (Ορεγω, vel pedes vel manus extendo,) denotes Extension—in Space or EARTH; and we shall be convinced, that the word is derived from this spot, when we remember the adjacent term ORG*uia*, (Οργυια, Spatium interjectum vel inter pedes divaricantes vel ambas manus expansas; Ulna;—Passus, &c.) A *Step*, which signifies a measure on the Land or EARTH. In the ordinary Vocabularies both these words are considered as roots. OREGO ARD ORG*uia*, (Ορεγω, pedes extendo, Οργυια, Spatium interjectum inter pedes divaricantes,—Passus,) relate to a *Step*, Τρις μεν Ορεξατ' ιων, Ter quidem protendit gressum. (Il. N. v. 20.) In the term ORIG*naomai*, (Οριγναομαι, Desidero, appeto,) bearing the metaphorical sense of OREGO, (Ορεγω, In *med.* Appeto,) we have the *n*, as an organical addition to the *G*. The preceding word to this term is *Origanon*, (Οριγανον, Origanum,) a species of Sweet Marjoram, which belongs to *Orego*, *Crignaomai*, (Ορεγω, Οριγναομαι,) where we have a vowel breathing inserted between the G and the organical addition of the *n*. The Etymologists imagine, that the *Oreiganon*, (Ορειγανον,) as it is sometimes

sometimes written, is so called because it is said Ορεγανυσθαι, "Monte gaudere," as Martinius observes; but it means, I believe, the *Desirable* or grateful herb, from its sweet smell, for the same reason as it is called by the Germans *Wohlgemuht*, Well pleasing to the Mind, "Ab odore suavi, *animum recreante*," says Martinius, explaining the German term.—To the idea of the *Root* or *Foundation* we must refer the Hebrew name for the Cedar, ארז ARZ. Mr. Parkhurst produces this word under רז RZ, "To Waste, "attenuate," &c., as it might denote the *Slender* tree, or the "*Wasting* Tree, by the exudation of its resinous juice; though he justly corrects these notions, by supposing, that the original idea is that of "*Firm*, *Stable*, *Durable*, or the like," as in the parallel Arabic term. In Arabic, ارز Erz, or Urz, signifies "The pine, cedar, pitch, juniper, or any cone-bearing tree. "Erez. A Tree whose timber is very hard. Ariz. Contracting, "collecting, or *Fixing one's self.* — Firmly Rooted (tree.) — "A Chief, leader, demagogue;" which I produced at the commencement of my Work. The terms, which I have already produced under the form ^RC, ^RD, &c., as denoting the *Base* or *Foundation* of the Earth, will amply illustrate the truth of my hypothesis; and I shall now proceed to consider the form of our Element ^C, ^D, where the *r* does not appear, conveying a similar idea. — As we advance forward in these enquiries, we shall admire still more and more those secret and subtle workings of the mind, by which the resemblance of ideas, apparently remote to each other, is discovered, and applied with such precision and effect, to that infinite variety of purposes, which are accomplished by Human Speech.

CHAP. II.

SECT. II.

^C, ^D, ^G, &c.

Words denoting a Base *or* Foundation, *as of the* EArTH, ArK, ESTia, (Εστια,) *&c., as* Edos, (Εδος, *Basis:*)—*What is* Set—Founded—Established—Raised up, *or* Stands up, *as on a* Base *or* Foundation, *as* Ezomai, (Εζομαι, *Sedeo,)* Istemi, (Ιστημι, *&c. Statuo,—Sto.) &c. Terms signifying what is* Firm—Substantial—Strong—Stout, *&c., as fixed on a* Base, *&c., as* Is, (Ις, *Vis,) &c. Terms denoting* Kindred, *connected with the idea of the* Base, Foundation, Stem—Stock, *&c., as* Atta, (Αττα, *Pater,) &c. Words denoting what is* Placed—Situated, *or* Lies *in the same Spot, in a state of* Rest *or* Repose; *and hence* Rest, *or* Repose, *&c., as* Eudo, (Ευδω, *Dormio,) &c.—Words relating to* Time, *derived from the idea of that, which is* Established—Fixed, *or* Set, *as on a* Base *or* Foundation, *so as to* Last, Continue, Endure, *as* Age, *(Eng.) &c. Terms signifying a* Dwelling—Habitation, *&c., the appropriate—certain—fixed Spot, on which Persons are* Situated—Settled—Established, *&c., as* House, *(Eng.) &c.——Section the* IIId. *What is* Placed—Seated *or* Situated—Stands up, *&c., in an abstract sense; What* Exists *or* Is: *Hence the verb of Being,* Est, *(Lat.)* Is, *(Eng.) &c.—Demonstrative parts of Speech, as* Is, *(Lat.)* It, *(Eng.) &c.*

^C, ^D, &c.

The *Base* or *Foundation*. What is *Set—Founded—Established — Raised*, or *Stands up*, as on a *Base* or *Foundation*.

EDos. (Gr.) A Base, Foundation, a Seat, Temple, House, &c.

EDRA. (Gr.) A Base, Seat, Fundament.

IDRUO. (Gr.) To Place.

Izo. (Gr.) To Place.

Ezomai. (Gr.) To Sit—To be Placed, or Rest, as on a Base.

AS. (Arabic,) A Foundation, Basis.

AS-AS. (Arab.) A Foundation, Basis.

IZA. (Arab.) Supporting, Propping

ISB. (Arab.) Fundament.

ISTAT. (Arab.) Buttocks, Fundament.

AST. (Pers.) Buttocks, Hips, Fundament.

IKSUS, ISKIS, OXUS, OSPHUS. (Gr.) Hips, Loins, &c.

OSKEA. (Gr.) Scrotum.

IST-*emi*. (Gr.) To Place, Stand.

IST-*aden*, &c. (Pers.) To Stand, Stop, Dwell.

AST—EST—Is, &c. &c. (Pers. Lat. Eng. &c.) Is—Placed, Locatur.

ISTI*khar*. (Per.) Persepolis, from

ISTA. (Pers.) Place, Station, Dwelling.

ASTI. (Syr.) To Found, Establish.

ASTU. (Greek,) A City, the Foundation.

ISTANDEN. (Pers.) To Place, Fix, Stand up.

ASTANDAN. (Goth.) To Stand up, Remain, Endure.

EDEN. (Heb.) The Garden—the appropriate Place — or Settled Dwelling.

ADEN. (Ar.) The Garden of *Eden*:—A Permanent Dwelling.

ETHNOS. (Greek,) The People, Settled in a certain spot.

ATHENAI. (Gr.) ATHENS, the City.

EDIN-*Borough*—EDEN—ETON, &c. (Eng.) Names of Places, Men, &c.

We have seen in the preceding Section a race of words, under the form ^RC, ^RD, &c., denoting the *Base* or *Foundation*, as of the Earth. I shall produce in this second Section a race of words, conveying a similar idea under the form ^C, ^D, &c., when the *r* does not appear. We shall find, that this Radical meaning has afforded various senses, some of which may appear on the first glance remote from each other; though, on a more attentive view, it will readily be understood, that they are all impressed with the same common notion. I shall consider in this Section words which signify, What is *Set — Founded — Established — Raised up* or *Stands up*, as on a *Base* or *Foundation*; such as Ezomai, (Εζομαι, Sedeo;) Istemi, (Ιστημι, &c. Statuo, Sto;) &c. &c. — Terms, which denote what is *Firm — Substantial — Strong — Stout*, &c., as Is, (Ις, Vis,) &c. — Terms expressing *Kindred*, as connected with the idea of the *Base* or *Foundation — Stem — Stock*, &c., as Atta, (Ατται, Pater,) &c. &c. — Words signifying, what is *Placed — Situated* or *Laid* in the same Spot, as in a state of *Rest* or *Repose*; and hence *Rest* or *Repose*, &c., as Eudo, (Ευδω, Dormio.) — Words relating to *Time*, derived from the idea of that, which is *Established — Fixed* or *Set*, as on a *Base* or *Foundation*, so as to *Last, Continue, Endure*; as Age, (Eng.) &c. — Terms signifying a *Dwelling* or *Habitation* — the appropriate — certain — fixed Spot, on which persons are *Situated — Settled, Established*, &c., as House, (Eng.) &c. We shall understand, that the idea of the *Enclosure* must be sometimes connected with this race of words, House, &c., as denoting the Appropriate — Peculiar Spot — Separate and Distinguished from other spots.—Lastly, I shall produce in another Section a race of words, which signify what is *Placed — Seated* or *Situated* in an abstract sense;—what *Exists* or Is. — Hence are derived the universal verb of Being, as Est, (Lat.) Is, (Eng.) &c., and the Demonstrative parts of Speech, Is, (Lat.) It, (Eng.) &c. &c.

This

This enquiry will lead us into new and curious views on the formation of Human Speech.

The Greek Est*ia*, (Εστια, Focus, Lar, — Domus; — Ara; — Asylum; — Vesta, Dea; — Sedes, v. gr. Imperii,) will first present itself in considering this race of words; as it contains in itself some of the leading senses, which are supposed in my hypothesis. The word, we see, not only signifies the *Base — Bottom*, as the Hearth, — the *Seat*, and the House, on or in which any thing or person is *Settled* or *Established;* but it likewise brings us to the very spot, the Earth, or Ea'th, &c., from which, as I suppose, these ideas are derived. In the two examples produced by R. Ainsworth under this Greek word, we find it connected with Arche, (Αρχη, Principium, Exordium, Initium, *Fundamentum,)* the corresponding term, under the form ^RC, &c., as *Aph'* Est-*ias* Arch-*esthai*, (Αφ' Εστιας Αρχεσθαι, Consentaneum rei gerendæ Initium capere,) — *Aph'* Est-*ias* Arch-*omenos*, (Αφ' Εστιας Αρχομενος.) In the sense of the *Focus*, we perceive how the term agrees with the English Hearth. The signification of the verb Est*iao*, (Εστιαω, Lare vel Domo excipio; — Convivio excipio,) To Entertain at a Feast, appears very remote from the idea of the Earth or *Ground;* and yet we see how readily they are connected with each other, through the medium of the House, *Established* or *Situated* on the *Ground.* In the Latin *v*-Est*a* we perceive, that the Labial breathing, if I may so express it, has assumed a Consonant form. In the Greek E*zomai*, (Εζομαι, Sedeo,) Ed*os*, (Εδος, Sedes, Sella, Delubrum, Templum, *Ædes*, Simulachrum, Firmamentum, *Basis*,) Ed*ra*, (Εδρα, Sella, Sedes; — *Basis*, Podex hominis, Latrina,) Id*ruo*, (Ιδρυω, Sedere facio, Statuo,) I*zo*, (Ιζω, Sedere facio, colloco, sedeo,) Is*temi*, (Ιστημι, Colloco; — in Aor. 2. perf. plusq. perf. *Sto,)* all which I have before produced, and which may be considered only as different forms of Est*ia*, (Εστια,) we see precisely the train of ideas, supposed in my hypothesis.

In

In the Latin *Sto* the breathing before the *S* is lost. The explanatory term *Sedeo*, and its parallel words *Sit*, *Seat*, *Set*, &c. &c., belong to the Element SD, ST, &c,

In Welsh, *Dechreu* or *d*-ECHREU signifies, " A Beginning, " an Origin, an Original," which the Lexicographers of that Language have justly referred to ARCHE, (Ἀρχη.) The *d* in this Welsh word is an addition from the construction of the Language, and the *r* in ECH*r*-*eu* is the lengthening of the sound after the Elementary consonant *Ch*, as it is in A*r*CHE before it. In Welsh we have *d*-YRCH*afael*, which is the same as ARCH*afael*, " To " Ascend, exalt, rise or lift," where we have the original form YRCH or ARCH.—In Welsh, ACH is " A *Stem* or Pedigree, the " lineage of one's Ancestors;" where we are directly brought to the idea of the *Base* or *Foundation;* and in Mr. Shaw's Galic and Irish Dictionary we have AIC, " A Tribe or Family," and AICE, " A Prop." We perceive, that these words belong to each other, and are to be referred to the idea of the *Base*. The Celtic terms, here produced, will be referred to other words of a similar kind in a future page. In Arabic, اس As or Uss, as Mr. Richardson represents it, means, " A *Foundation*, *Basis*.— " The Heart of Man, (as being the *Foundation* of life.) The " *Beginning* of any thing.—The earliest age, Eternity.—The " cinders or ashes remaining in a fire-place." In the succeeding column of Mr. Richardson's Dictionary we have اساس As-As, " A *Foundation*, *Basis*," which is a doubling of اس As, in order to express more strongly the idea. In the same Language اغاز *Aghaz* means " A Beginning, commencement." Whether this word should be considered as a compound, AGH-AZ, of the same kind as AS-AS, I cannot decide.

There is an extraordinary term in Arabic, AJ-UZ, عجوز which I offer to the consideration of the Arabic Scholar to decide, whether this word likewise may not possibly be a compound

of

of a similar kind; or, if it be not a compound, whether *Ajuz* or AJZ does not belong to the simple form اس As. This word has no less than sixty-seven different significations, according to Mr. Richardson. The first sense of the word, in the arrangement of this Lexicographer, is "An old Woman;" and in the tenth sense we have "The Universe, the World, the EARTH." We shall not be inclined to believe, as I imagine, that the sense of "An old Woman" was the origin of sixty-seven significations. In the preceding column of Mr. Richardson's Dictionary I find UJUZ عجز "Having large Hips. 2. Plural of عجوز" AJUZ, the term just produced.—"AJUZ. The Hinder or last part of the "back, the *Buttocks*, (of man or woman.)" The succeeding term is عجزا "AJZA. Having large *Buttocks* (a Woman.)" We shall agree, I think, that all these words belong to each other, and that the sense of the *Buttocks* brings us to that of the اس As, the *Base* or *Foundation*. We shall likewise understand, that the sense of "An old Woman" belongs to the idea of "Large "*Buttocks*." I shall produce various words, denoting the *Buttocks*, belonging to this race of words; and we have already seen the Greek Ed*ra*, (Podex hominis,) ARCH-*os*, (Αρχος, Princeps, Podex,) and the vulgar English name for this part. I cannot quit the word AJUZ, without observing, that among its sixty-seven significations it means "A King.—A Kingdom.—A Governor of "a Province, or City," which again agrees with the sense of a *Base* or *Foundation*, as in the Greek word last produced. I must leave however the explication of this word, in its various senses, to the adept in the Arabic Language.—In Arabic, ايز IZA means "Supporting, Propping, causing to Sustain or Bear up." In the same opening of Mr. Richardson's Dictionary, where this word occurs, we have the Persian ايستادن IST*aden*, "To *Stand*, "stop, stay, remain, to tarry, wait for."—ايستاندن IST*AN den*, "To Place, fix, make, constitute, appoint, to *Stand* up," &c.,

ایستانیدن Istan*iden*, "To Place in the middle;" and ایستیدن Ist*iden*, "To Stand." In Saxon, Astan*dan* is "Durare, Stare, "Manere, Subsistere," as Lye explains it.

In Persian, است Ast or Ist, as Mr. Richardson represents it, means "The Buttocks, Hips, Backside, Fundament." The following Greek words should probably be referred to the same idea: Iks*us*, Isk*is*, Ox*us*, Os*phus*, Osk*ea*, (Ιξυς, Ισχις, Οξυς, Οσφυς, Lumbus, Οσχεα, Scrotum.) In the same column of Mr. Richardson's Dictionary, where اس As occurs, we have اساب As*ab*, "Fundaments." To this form we must refer the Persian name for a Horse, اسب As*b*, which is found in the same opening of Mr. Richardson's Dictionary. It means probably the animal, on which a person is *Seated*, or which is ridden. The succeeding Arabic word is اسب Is*b*, "The Fundament, Pubes," &c., which is another form of the term just produced. The preceding word to the Persian است Ast or Ist, the Buttocks, is another word, under the same form است Ast or Est, the familiar verb of Being, corresponding with Is, (Eng.) Est, (Lat.) &c., which, as we shall now understand, is derived from the idea of what is *Placed — Seated — Situated*, &c. &c. In the same column of Mr. Richardson's Dictionary is the Arabic است (AST,) Est for Ass, اس, says this writer, which in its first sense means "A Foundation, Basis," and afterwards *Eternity* — A *Continued* — *Lasting* Period, as Est does. We have moreover in the same column the Arabic استا Ista, "The warp in the loom, fitting "the warp to the loom," which will remind us of the Greek Ist-*os*, from Ist*emi*, (Ιστος, Malus navis, — *Malus, seu lignum, e quo stamina seu Tela suspenditur; — Ipsa Tela,)* the Arabic استات Istat, "Buttocks, Fundaments," the Persian استادانیدن Ist*adaniden*, "To Constitute, establish, fix, make to Stand," and استادن Ist*aden*, "To stand, stop, dwell." In the succeeding column we have the Persian استام "Ustam. Faith, confidence.

"Any

"Any thing to which we can trust, a confidant, prop, support, "pillar, column." The Arabic استاه ISTAH, Buttocks, and استان *Astan*, "Roots of old trees," and the Persian استاندن IST*anden*, "To Stand, constitute, set up, establish."

Between these latter words we have the Persian استان ASIT*an*, UST*an*, "A Threshold, entrance. A King's Court, "Royal palace, the Ottoman Porte," and the name of Constantinople, استانبول *Istanbul*, which is sometimes written and spoken *Stanbul* or *Stambul*. This term, though originally formed from the City of *Constantinople*, (Constantine, *Cnstantinople*, Cstantinple, *Stantnple*, *Stanbul*, *Stambul*,) has perhaps assumed more particularly the form *Istan*, that it may correspond with the Persian *Ustan*, A Palace. In Arabic, بلد *BLD* is a City, belonging to *Polis*, (Πολις); so that perhaps *Istanbul* may convey to an Eastern mind, ignorant of its primitive meaning, the idea of the *Court* or *Palace*, *City*, the *City* where the Sultan has his *Court* or *Palace*. It is very common, when the origin of a word is forgotten, to adapt the sound and the form, remaining from its primitive idea, to a similar sound and form, more known, and expressing a sense, which might naturally be represented by the word in question. The Prince Cantemir has formed another derivation of *Stanpol*, which is that of *Eis Teen Polin*, Εις την πολιν. The author of the *Mechanisme du Langage*, (Tom. I. p. 428.) though he is aware of the obvious origin of the word, seems to think that this is the true derivation, because that Prince was "*bien instruit des faits.*" The Prince was furnished with no facts which qualified him for the office of an Etymologist. These terms استادن IST*aden*, "To Stand," &c. more directly connect themselves with the Greek IST*emi*, (Ιστημι, Statuo—a. 2. &c. Sto,) and the Latin *Sto*. In the Latin, the breathing before the ST is lost. In IST*anden* استاندن and in the English *Stand*, we have the Radical *St*—*N*, which conveys the same idea, through the whole compass of Language,

Language, and on which I shall make a few observations in a succeeding page.

In the same leaf of Mr. Richardson's Dictionary, from which I have produced the Persian Ist*anden*, &c. To Stand, &c., we have Ist*ikhar*, استخار the name of the Ancient Persepolis. Many opinions have been given respecting the origin of this word; yet I imagine, that the true idea is partly to be found in one of the conjectures of Mr. Richardson. He supposes that "Ista denotes A *Place*, *Station*, *Dwelling*, (from the Persian "*Istaden*, To Stand, remain, dwell,)" which, I think, is the true idea belonging to the word. He imagines, moreover, that "*Khur* or *Khar* signifies the *Sun*; whence *Istakhar* will naturally "imply, *the Place* or *Temple of the Sun*." (Pref. p. 27.) This I do not conceive; as I cannot but think, that if such had been the origin of the word, we should have found it expressed in the Greek translation. The Persian *Istikhar* may be simply Istkha, the *Place* or *Position*, by way of eminence; or if *Khar* be significant, it has a similar meaning of the *Place*—*Position*, *City*, &c. In Arabic, سهر *Shahur* and كورت *Koorut* (pl. كور *Kuwur*) signify a *City*, from the idea of a certain *Spot*—*Place*, &c. I am aware, that the Persian *Istakhar* was adopted, before that nation engrafted the Language of the Arabs into their own, as it is found at present; yet the force of the Element was equally existing at all times.—Whether the *Khar* be significant, or only Ist or Istka; it is manifest, that the word was considered by the Greeks as Denoting the Distinguished Spot—or Place—The *City*, by way of Eminence, above other Persian Cities, from their translation *Persepolis*, *The City* of the Persians. The term استخار *Istikhar*, which denotes *Persepolis*, means in Arabic "Praying for the blessing of God, praying for success," &c. &c.; and there are other words in the same and in the succeeding column of Mr. Richardson's Dictionary, which have a similar sense.

sense. The idea, I imagine, in these words is the same as in those terms, which I have examined; and the sense of *Praying* and *Petitioning* is derived from the notion of being *Instant* in Prayer, as we express it; where we have the metaphor of that which is *Constant, Remaining* or *Persevering* in an Action. The Latins use *Insisto,* which signifies To '*Stand* upon,' in the first sense, after a similar manner, "To Urge, *Insist* upon, or be "*Instant* in," says R. Ainsworth. In the same column we have IST*idamet*, "Assiduity—Wishing to be Quiet, Permanent, Steady, "Eternal, Perpetual, Everlasting." In the succeeding column we have the Arabic استدعا ISTIDA, "Petitioning, requesting "submissively," &c. From the IST است denoting *Petitioning*, is derived the tenth conjugation of Arabic verbs. The succeeding word but one is the Persian استدن IST*aden*, "To Arise, Rise "up, *Stand*, to work *Standing*." The Greek IKET*es*, (Ικετης, Supplex, qui humiliter et more servili aliquid orat,) which is a very strong term, may belong to ISTIDA, &c.; though it probably belongs to the Greek IK*neomai*, (Ικνεομαι, Venio, advenio; —Supplico, obsecro,) where we are brought to the IK—AK, &c, or EARTH, under the idea of Motion upon its surface.

The very name for the Sun, *Khur,* belongs to the idea of the *Place—Spot—Station*, or the *Enclosed* Spot, or Station—the *Enclosure;* which supplies a race of words signifying a *City—Town*, &c. &c. The metaphor of a *Place* or *Station* is often annexed to the Luminaries above us—those *Spots—Places* or *Stations* in the Heavens. The term *Spots* in the Heavens is applied to the *Stars;* and *Spot* we know means at once a Speck and a *Place.* I shall shew that *Stella* in Latin is derived from a similar idea; and we all remember in Milton—

"The Planets in their *Stations* listening stood."

This term for the Sun, *Khur,* has given the name to *Syria,* as *Abulfeda*

Abulfeda has justly conjectured; and Mr. Bryant has seen, that *Suros* or *Seirios* "(Συρος γαρ ὁ ἡλιος the same as Σειριος)" belongs to this name for the Sun, as he is quoted in the page of Mr. Richardson's Preface to his Dictionary, from which I have taken the above quotation. All that follows they have not seen. The Persian *Khur* belongs to our word STAR, and to the parallel terms in other Languages, as the Greek *aster*, (Αστηρ,) the Latin *astrum*, the Saxon *Steorra*, the German *Stern*, the Danish *Stierne*, the Belgic *Sterre*, the Cornish *Sterran*, the Armoric *Steren*, the Welsh *Ser*, *Syr*, and *Seren*, &c. I cannot sufficiently express my surprise to find in Skinner a derivation of the Greek *Aster*, (Αστηρ,) from the Persian *Ster*, "Vossius autem Gr. Αστηρ, à "Persico *Ster* deflectit." It is extraordinary, that either Vossius or Skinner should resort to a Persian word; and it is more extraordinary, when we learn, that the Persian term appears to have a very different form, and to be removed from this race of words. Mr. Richardson represents the Persian name for a *Star* by *Sitaureh;* though in recording the letters, which compose it, we must represent it by STARH ستارہ. A Vowel breathing, we see, has been inserted in the pronunciation between the two letters, which in fact represent the first letter of the Radical. The same has happened in the Latin *Sider-is*, which is quasi SDER-*is*, and which belongs, as we see, to this race of words. Again, in Persian, اختر *akter* is "A STAR, constellation, celestial "sign."

Dr. Vincent (Periplus of the Erythrean Sea, p. 98.) has remarked, that *Seir*, in the Language of the Troglodytes, is a Dog; from whence *Sirius*, the Dog Star, as it is called, is supposed to be derived. That *Seir* in the Language of the Troglodytes signifies a Dog, I can very well conceive; as there are few Languages, in which it has not that meaning, or a sense, from which that meaning is derived. Thus we have

CUR

CUR in English, *Korre* in Belgic, גור GUR, in Hebrew, Catellus, the parallel terms produced by the Etymologists under *Curr*. Lhuyd, under Canis, gives us among other terms the Irish *Gayear*, *Gyr*, A *Grey* Hound, *Greχ;* and in the Appendix, under Canis, we have "Isl. *Grey*, Finnon. et Lap. *Coira*." We shall see, that GREY-Hound belongs to the *Cur;* and we shall readily understand, that all these terms for a Dog are attached to such words as *Curro*. In Arabic, ضرو *Ziroo* is "A Hunting Dog." It will now be granted, I trust, that SIR*ius* in its original sense meant nothing but the SER—the STAR—the *Distinguished Bright* STAR; and that the idea of the *Dog* was added from a similarity in sounds between the SEIR, CUR, the *Dog*, &c., and SER, SYR, STAR, &c., the Luminary. In Orpheus, &c., SEIR*ios*, (Σειριος,) is added to the name of the Sun, and literally means the STAR or SYR—the Sun.

Ημος ὁτε τριτσην μεν ελειπετο ΣΕΙΡΙΟΣ αιγλην
Ηελιος. (*Argonaut.* ϕ. 118-9.)

In Greek, the name of a *Star* sometimes appears under the form TR, as TEIR*ea*, (Τειρεα, Astra,) which the Lexicographers derive from *Teiro*, (Τειρω, Vexo.)

Εν δε τα ΤΕΙΡΕΑ παντα τα τ' Ουρανος εστεφανωται. (Il. Σ. 485.)

The *Triones*, the seven Stars at the North Pole, meant originally, I imagine, the TEIR*ea*, (Τειρεα,) or *s*TARS, and have nothing to do with *Triones*, the oxen, except by the accidental similarity of the sound of the words. I shew in another place, that the ARC*tus*, the constellation at the *North*, has been supposed to be *Bear*, from a similar cause—the similarity of sounds. ARC*tus* only means the certain EARTH—Place—or Quarter, as of the *n*-ORTH, &c. The TRION-*es* is the same form as *s*TEREN, &c.

Mr. Richardson has observed, that "When ESTHER was

"selected

" selected among other virgins for the royal choice, her former " name *Hadassah* was dropt, and a new one given to her, sig- " nifying in Persian a *Star.*" (Dissertation, p. 20.) Thus we see, that *E*-STER is the *A*-STER, (Αστηρ,) STARH, or STAR. Hence has been derived the name of the Syrian Venus *ASTAR-te;* and this derivation will explain, why she is conceived by some to be the *Moon.* The *ASHTAROth* of the Philistines belongs to ASTAR-*te*, as the Mythologists understand. Mr. Parkhurst derives *Ashtaroth* עשתרת from עשה ASH, To Make, and תר TR, A Tour, compass, "*from the Tours she makes about the Earth*," where we see in תר TR and *Tour*, the race of words, to which STAR belongs. Mr. Parkhurst observes, that " Perhaps the German idol EOSTRE " or EASTER was related to the Oriental ASTAR*te* To this " goddess our Saxon Ancestors sacrificed in April, which was " therefore by them styled *Eostur Monath*; and thence our word " EASTER, which the Saxons retained after their conversion to " Christianity, and gave to the solemn festival observed at the " same time of the year, in commemoration of our Saviour's " resurrection. See *Bochart*, Vol. I. 676, and *Ancient Universal* " *History*, Vol. XIX. p. 177." This conjecture is, I imagine, just. To this Saxon name for an illustrious Female might possibly belong the termination ESTRF, in that Language, for a Female in general;—" ESTRE. Terminatio Fœminina substantivi " agentis: sc. Ut nomina masculi generis, apud Latinos, in *or* " terminantia, formant Fœminina in *ix;* sic apud Anglo-Saxones, " in ESTRE, ISTRF, YSTRE. e. g. *Sang*-YSTRE, Cantatrix, &c." I shall shew, that the Element ^S denotes *Being*, through the whole compass of Language; and to this belongs the Latin *Ix*, and perhaps the Saxon *Estre.* The Persian name *Statira* belongs to *Sitaur*, the STAR, as others have understood. It is likewise known, that *Roxana* is derived from another Persian word signifying Light; though it is not known, that *Roxana* belongs

to

to *Radius*, and that it precisely corresponds, in metaphor and Elementary characters, with *Radiant*—the *Radiant* form.

The ZOR or *Tsor*, in the name *Zoroaster*, belongs to *Sitaur*—*Staur* or *Star*. We perceive, that in *Statira* there is a breathing before the letters, which represent, as I imagine, the first Radical Consonant; but in the *Zor* or *Tsor* we perceive the true form. The *Oastres* or *Astres* belongs to the Element STRS, denoting the Sage or learned personage, under the idea of the *Searcher*—*Enquirer*, &c. The vowel breathing before STRS is derived either from some intensive particle, or is an organical addition to the consonants ST, &c. The ASTRES is the same as IDRIS, &c.—a name well known in the ancient world for a *Seer*, *Prophet*, &c. &c. Among the Celts we have the *Giant* IDRIS, "whose "memory," as Mr. Davies has justly observed, "is perpetuated "by one of the highest and most pointed mountains in North "Wales, called *Cader* IDRIS, the *chair*, or *keep*, of IDRIS. It may, "perhaps, have been an observatory, in ancient periods." (Celtic Researches, p. 173.) Mr. Davies has likewise properly understood some of the parallel terms, to which IDRIS belongs. "Ιδρις, "in Greek," as he observes, "implies an expert, or skilful "person; and ידרש *Idresh*, in Hebrew, from דרש *Dresh*, To *seek*, "*search, inquire diligently*. *Hydres* has a similar meaning in "Welsh." (Id. p. 174.) Mr. Davies is, I believe, right. The Greek *Idris*, (Ιδρις,) belongs to the Radical DRS, and has only an accidental similarity to ID-*on*—*Eido*, (Ιδων, Videns, Ειδω, Video,) with which indeed it appears to be directly connected.—I find, however, that the ordinary Lexicographers derive Ιδρεια, Peritia, from Ιστημι.—Mr. Parkhurst has referred to the Hebrew דרש the Oriental term *Dervise*, and the Celtic *Andraste*, the Goddess of Vengeance. The former derivation may perhaps be right, but the latter is, I conceive, wrong.

The term דרש DRS belongs to DIRT, *Dust*, *Dig*. &c. &c.

Words denoting *Search*—*Enquiry*, &c. have been commonly derived from the idea of *Routing* or Scratching about—amongst—into—up, &c. the *Dirt* of the Earth. We know, that *Scrutor* is acknowledged to be derived from a similar metaphor,—*Scruta Eruendi*. *Scrutor* belongs more directly to *Search*—*Scratch*, and ultimately to דרש DRS. The succeeding word to this in Mr. Parkhurst's Lexicon,—the term דש DS, must be referred likewise to the same race; and here the sound of *r* between the Radical Consonants is lost. The word דש DS means, says Mr. Parkhurst, "To Thresh, beat or Scatter, to pieces," to which this Lexicographer justly refers *Dash*, *Dust*. Let us note another of these terms in the explanatory word *Thresh*, under the form TRS, and mark moreover the word *Scatter*, where the *r* does not appear. I am not attempting to adjust the degrees of affinity between these words:—I mean only to observe, that they are all to be referred to terms denoting the *Dust*, *Dirt*—*Grit*, &c. of the Earth; and that they were derived from actions performed on the surface of it. To the Hebrew דרש DRS more immediately belongs the Greek DERKO, (Δερκομαι, vel Δερκω, Video.) In Persian, درک DRK, with the auxiliary verb کردن *Kurden*, signifies "To comprehend, To perceive, To follow out, prosecute;" and DERK itself means "The lowest part.—The Pit (of Hell.)—"A Part of the *Earth*, a portion of the *Ground*." Here we are at once brought to the spot, supposed in my hypothesis. On the other side of the leaf in Mr. Richardson's Dictionary, where this word is found, we have درد DRD, "*Dregs*, sediment, the "*Tartar* of wine, the mother of oil.—A *Draught*;" where let us mark the explanatory terms *Dregs*, *Tartar*, and *Draught*, all belonging to this race of words. In the Galic Dialect of the Celtic, DEARcam means "To see, behold, look stedfastly;" and in Welsh, EDRYCH means "To behold, to look, to view, to see," which the Lexicographers in this Language allow to belong

to

to the Greek *Derko*, (Δερκω.) We perceive in EDRYCH a vowel breathing at the beginning, as in IDRIS.

Mr. Davies has properly observed, that IDRIS or EDRIS was well known to the Arabians. His name in Arabic is ادريس *Adris* or *Idris*, as Mr. Richardson represents it, who tells us, that it is "the Arabian name for اخنوخ" *Achnuch*, "Enoch the "prophet, (Gen. v. 21.) This name is derived from *Ders*, "which signifies study or meditation." The Arabic *Ders* درس belongs to the same idea. The first sense, which Mr. Richardson gives of it, is "Reading, a lecture, a lesson;" and in the second sense, "A hidden path, the traces almost effaced," where we are brought to the original spot. The Persians have joined it with an auxiliary verb, and made it signify "To Tread or "Thresh out corn," where we are again brought to the original spot and action connected with it. Let us mark the explanatory words *Trace*, *Tread*, *Thresh*, all belonging to each other; and to the Arabic *Ders*, the path or *Trace*. After the most mature consideration on the origin of the great Celtic name for a *Seer*—*Priest*—*Prophet*—the DRUID, I finally imagine, that it belongs to this race of words, and denotes the *Searcher*. Mr. Shaw explains the Galic *Draoi* (which I consider to be quasi *Draoj*,) and DRAOITH, by "A DRUID, Augur, Charmer, Magician;" in the next column to which, I find DRAOS, *Trash;* where let us again mark, both in the Galic and English words, other terms belonging to the same race—To DIRT, &c. I find likewise in the same column "DREACH. Form, figure, image.—DREACH*ach*. That "Dresseth, polisheth; *Drawn*, figured, delineated.—DREACH*am*. "To Figure, delineate, adorn;" and "DREACHT. A Poem, "*Draught*, Pattern." We perceive, that all these belong to the same train of ideas, and mean To TRACE; and let us note the explanatory terms *Drawn* — DRAUGHT, directly corresponding with the Galic term in every point. The terms DRAG, *Draw*, DRAUGHT,

Draught, relate to the action performed amongst the Dregs or Dirt of the Ground. The final Radical Consonant is lost in *Draw*, though it is preserved in the parallels *Dragan*, (Sax.) &c. &c. It is lost likewise in the term *Draoi*, though it is preserved in Draoith. Let us again note another explanatory term, *Dress*, which belongs to the same race, as we shall all agree, when we recollect the original application of the word, To *Dress* or Till *Land*. In Welsh, the Druids are called *Derwyddon*. No conjecture can be more probable, than that, which is commonly received, respecting the origin of these words from the *Derw*, or Oak; and the name in Welsh has no doubt been so written on the idea of this origin. Still, however, this, as I conceive, is not so; and I have produced, as I imagine, the true Etymology.

The name of *Zoroastres* appears under a great variety of forms; but that of the Greeks seems to be as precise, as the nature of the case will admit. By Mr. Richardson, who is very loud against the authority of the Greeks, he is called *Zeratusht*, which likewise is sufficiently exact, as the same cognate consonants remain to record the identity of the word. Though, if my derivation should be right, the Greeks, by the addition of the *r*, have been more precise in their representation of the name. This however is too minute a remark, and of little use or importance in these investigations. The words signifying To *See*—*Search*, &c. appear, in the Persian and other Languages, alike under the forms DRS, and DS without the *r*; which letter, as it may be considered only as a symbol to lengthen out the vowel with which it is connected, is of no consequence in the determination of the Radical. M. Anquetil, in his work on the *Zend Avesta*, sometimes represents the name of *Zoroaster* by *Zerethoschtresch*. Strange and uncouth even as this representation may appear, it preserves a faithful record of the name, as it is exhibited by the other forms; and has been only rendered thus uncouth in its appearance, by

by an attempt at extreme accuracy. In the *Zer* we have *Zor;* and in the *Ethoschtresch,* or *Ethschtresch,* we unequivocally see the *Oastres* of the Greeks in the representation *Zor-Oastres.* This cluster of consonants, *Thscht,* was adopted for the same reason that the Greeks applied their two Consonants ST, in order to express the mingled sounds as conveyed to the ear in the Persian pronunciation of this word, or as represented by the letter or letters adopted by the Persians on this occasion. These mingled sounds, which were probably heard in the enunciation of the word, are very inadequately expressed in Mr. Richardson's form *Zera-Tusht* by the single symbol T. Yet this is perfectly sufficient for all the purposes of Etymology. There is no difficulty at all in the representation of the word by M. Anquetil, except, that a vowel breathing has inserted itself in this cluster of consonants *Thscht,* which we see has become *Thoscht;* since it is almost impossible to enunciate such mingled sounds without the insertion of a vowel. I have sufficiently explained the nature of these mingled sounds in the former part of my Work, (page 27,) where I have shewn, that the sound of a Russian letter has been represented by *Chtch.*

I cannot leave my observations on this title *Oastres,* or *Idris,* without once more recurring to the Greek IDRIS, (Ἰδρις,) and confirming by a most unequivocal example the true origin of the word. In the instance which I shall produce, IDRIS, (Ἰδρις,) is actually applied as the Welsh IDRIS is, to a *Celtic* or *Chaldean* Sage—skilled in Astronomy.

Ου γαρ κεν τις ιδοι θνητων μεροπων κραινοντα,
Ει μη μουνογενης τις απορρωξ φυλου ανωθεν
ΧΑΛΔΑΙΩΝ· ΙΔΡΙΣ γαρ ην ΑΣΤΡΟΙΟ ΠΟΡΕΙΗΣ,
Και σφαιρης κινημ᾽ αμφι χθονα ὡς περιτελλει,
Κυκλοτερες γ᾽ εν ισῳ, &c. (*Orph.* Frag. 2.)

These

These lines are found in the Fragments, collected under the name of Orpheus.—It is not necessary to enquire, who was the writer of these lines, or to whom they allude, or what they precisely mean. We see plainly, what is enough for our purpose, that the IDRIS, (Ἰδρις,) is applied to a Chaldean Sage—learned in the course of the Stars or of the Sun; and we can readily believe, that the Mystic, who wrote these lines, well knew a title belonging to his art, however skilled he might be in the nature of the Greek Language, or of Astronomy.

The origin of the word ISTIK*har*, the City, has led me into a short digression, from which I shall now return to the consideration of terms belonging to our Element ^ST, &c. denoting the *Fixed—Established, Place* or *Position*—the *Settlement*, &c. We shall instantly agree, that the Greek ASTU, (Αστυ, Urbs, *Astu*, seu *Asty;* peculiariter *Athenæ*,) belongs to this idea, which the Etymologists understand. Martinius derives it "à Σταω, ut *Stadt* à "*Stehen*. Syr. אשתי" ASTI, "Fundare. Αστειος, Civilis, festivus, "pulcher." In Syriac, we see ASTI signifies To *Found, Establish*, &c. From ASTU, (Αστυ,) is derived *Asteios*, (Αστειος,) and to this word we must refer the Latin *Astutus*, though some even doubt on this point. ASTU is used peculiarly for *Athens*, "An in ASTU venit? Terentius, Eunuch. A. 5. S. 5. *Athenas* "intelligit," says Vossius. "Ita et Cic. 2. de Legg. Ut vestri "Attici, priusquam Theseus eos demigrare ex agris, et in ASTU, "quod appellatur, omnes conferre se jussit, et Sunii erant et "Attici." Perhaps *Athens*, *Athenæ*, (Αθηνη,) is nothing but the ASTU, the City. The *n* may be only an organical addition to the *T*, or the *Then* may be significant, corresponding with *Town*, &c.; so that *Athene* or AT-THENE may be AST-TOWN—the Established Place—Settled Spot—the Settlement. In ATT*ica* the *n* does not appear; and if my hypothesis should be right, the name of *Attica* must have succeeded that of the City. Whether

Whether the Goddess of Wisdom or of Weaving, *Athena*, (Αθηνα, Minerva,) is derived from the Place, over which she presided, or from some other source, must be the subject of a future Enquiry.

The Element $\overline{\text{ST}}$-N, T-N, D-N, C-N, denotes, through the whole compass of Language, the Appropriate Place — Spot — Land — the Established Spot, &c. &c.; and to this Element we must refer *Stand — Town — Country — County*, and the TN, DN, in the names of Villages, Cities, &c. &c., *Hamp*-TON, *Lon*DINUM. This sense of *DN* in *Lon*-DIN-*um*, &c. &c. &c. is so obvious, that it has been remarked by every adventurer in the craft of Etymology. Their researches however have stopped at the threshold of the enquiry. The DN in *Medina* has a similar meaning. In Arabic, مدن *m*DN denotes a City, where the DN is significant, and the *m* only arises from the construction of the Language. We have seen the Persian word ISTAN*den*, or *Ist*-STAN*den*, استاندن To Place, &c.; and hence we have the STAN in *Hindo*STAN, &c. The force of this Element is perpetually visible in the Persian Language. Hence we have the *Taun* or *Staun* in *Boostaun*, بستان the Persian term for a *Garden*; where let us mark the *Den* in *Garden*, or *Gard*-DEN, which has a similar meaning. The same Element supplies the names for a *Garden* in various Languages, as in the Hebrew גן GN, the Arabic جنت *Junnut*, &c. Dr. Vincent has produced the various modes, in which one portion of a compound expressing the name of an Eastern River is represented, which are the following: "*Djen*, "*Djan, Tschan, Tschen, Chan, Chen, Chin, Jen, Gen, Tschun, Chun*, "*Shan, San.*" We here see, that the union of consonants at the beginning of some of these words is meant to express the mingled sounds in the first letter of the Eastern word. We shall hence understand the nature of the Greek C*h*T*h*ON (Χθων, Terra,) and how *County* and *Town* may belong to this word, or how the forms

forms CN, TN may pass into each other. This word seems to be directly connected with the Eastern terms, expressing a similar idea; and the C*h* and T*h* at the beginning of the word are meant to express the mingled sounds, belonging to Eastern terms with such a meaning. The *Den* in *Eden*, the Garden of Paradise, must be referred to this race of words, and denotes the *Stand*—the certain fixed Place—Spot, &c., the *Settlement*, &c. The Ed in *Eden* or Ed-*Den* belongs probably to the race of words now under discussion, Ed-*os*, (Εδος, Sedes,) Ist-*emi*, (Ιστημι,) Ast*u*, (Αστυ,) &c. &c.

The Hebrew Lexicographers understand only by the word עדן ODN, Eden, that it signifies "Pleasure and Delight," which is certainly a familiar sense belonging to the word, as derived from the *Garden*, the Delightful Place; but in the corresponding Arabic term *Aden*, عدن as explained by Mr. Richardson, we see the genuine idea, "1. A *permanent dwelling*. 2. The Garden of "Eden." Mr. Parkhurst derives the Greek *Edone*, (Ηδονη, Voluptas,) from the Hebrew עדן ODN, which seems almost indubitable; yet we cannot but connect *Edone*, (Ηδονη, Voluptas,) with *Edus*, (Ηδυς, Suavis,) in which no idea like that, which we have annexed to these words, appears to exist. Perhaps *Edus*, (Ηδυς,) might have been formed by the Greeks from *Edone*, (Ηδονη,) which they considered as a substantive form.—The Greek *Ethnos*, (Εθνος, Gens, Natio:—Gens a verâ fide aliena,) is quasi Ethen-*os*, and means the People peculiar to a certain Aden, *Settled Spot*, or *Dwelling*. Whether *Heathen* and its parallel terms are derived from this, will be considered in another place. The Hebrew Lexicographers will see the original idea, which is annexed to עדן ODN, Eden, in a parallel term belonging to that Language, אדן ADN. Taylor explains this Hebrew word by "Dominus. "A Master, a Lord, a Sustainer; from אדן" ADN, "A *Base* or "*Column*, as Superiors are the Pillar and Support of Society; "and

" and the most high God is the Base and Support of the whole " Universe." This term perpetually occurs, and it is used oftentimes for the name of *Jehovah*. To this word has been usually referred the Greek ADONis; and we shall now understand, why *Gardens* have been connected with this name, *Horti Adonidis*, &c. It has arisen from a confusion in the names of ADON, the Man, &c., and EDEN, the Garden. The same form and meaning, which we have in the Eastern terms *Eden*, or *Aden*, we find in our names of Towns and Men; the *Edin* in *Edin*borough, *Eton*, *Eden*, *Hatton*, *Aston*, &c. &c.; and *Athenæ* may be a compound of a similar kind.

While I am examining the word *Astu*, (Αστυ,) in Martinius, I cast my eyes on another term in the same column — *Astandes*, (Αστανδης,) which, as he says, is a Tarentine word for *Nuncius*, " ab α et στηναι, quod *non Stet*, sed ambulet." This term probably belongs to the race of words before us, under the idea of these *Messengers* being placed at certain *Stands* or Stations; and thus it will correspond with the metaphor in our word *Post*. Though *Post* is derived, as we know, from *Position* or *Rest;* yet, in the expression *Post-Haste*, it is applied to the quickness of motion belonging to the Messenger. — Our ordinary Lexicographers have supposed, that ASTANDes, (Αστανδης,) is a Persian word; and they have explained it by " Nuncius, seu tabellarius Persicus, An- " garus." The form ASTAND-*es* coincides with that of the Persian ایستاندن *Istanden*, To Place, &c. Let us mark the explanatory term *Angarus*, or AGGAR-*os*, (Αγγαρος,) which in the latter form might be conceived as belonging to the present race of words under the Element ^G, ^S, &c., with a similar idea. In the interpretation, which is given of this word, we are brought to the very notion supposed in my hypothesis. AGGaros, Αγγαρος, is explained by " Nuncius, vel tabellarius regum Persarum, qui, " in *Statione sua Positus*, literas ab altero Angaro acceptas alteri

" tradebat, ut ita celerius perferrentur." This word, however, will be considered in another place. If the true form is AGGAR-*os*, it might belong to the Persian اسکدار *Uskudar*, " An Ambas-" sador, Envoy, *Messenger, Courier*." In the same column of Mr. Richardson's Dictionary I find the Arabic اسکان *Iskan*, " Causing one to stay, remain, continuing to dwell."

An adjacent word to the terms quoted above, in Mr. Richardson's Dictionary, is the Persian استخوان *Ustukhan*, " A Bone, " kernel stone of fruit," which means the *Substantial* part of any thing. The word *Substantial* itself, we know, belongs to this race of words, *Sto*, &c. We shall now understand the origin of the Greek OST*eon*, (Οστεον,) and the Latin Os, Oss-*is*. In Hebrew, עצם OZM denotes, says Mr. Parkhurst, " Strength, Solidity, " Firmness.—A *Bone*, from its Strength and Solidity," where the OZ belongs to the words before us. Some Etymologists derive OST*reia*, (Οστρειᾳ, Οστρεα, Ostrea, pisces testis tecti,) OST*rakon*, (Οστρακον, Testa nativa—Testa figlina,) from OST*eon*, (Οστεον,) and Os, Oss-*is*, the Hard Bony part, as it were, which is probably right; that is, they are probably derived from the idea conveyed by these words,—what is *Substantial*. *Oyster* occurs in various other Languages, as the Saxon *Ostre*, the German *Auster*, the Belgic *Oester*, the Danish *Oster-ling*, the French *Huistre*, or *Huitre*, the Italian *Ostria*, &c., the Spanish *Ostia*, the Welsh *Oestren*, which the Etymologists have produced. In Persian, too, IST*idia*, استریا is " An Oyster;" and it is curious, that this word occurs in one of the two columns of Mr. Richardson's Dictionary, from which I have taken the Eastern terms above quoted. The preceding term to this is the Persian UST*urden*, استردن " To Shave, Erase;" and as this word occurs among the terms, signifying what *Stands* firm—is *Substantial*, &c., it must probably be referred to the same idea. We know, that terms for opposite actions are derived from the same word, or

same

same idea, sometimes with a variation to mark the difference, and sometimes by the use of the same word. Thus, To *Root*, and *Up-Root*, *E-Radicare*, &c.; and in To *Peel*, To *Stone*, &c., the very words are used to express the removal of the *Peel*—*Stone*, &c., quasi, To *Un-Peel*, *Un-Stone*. So, I imagine, Ust*urden* signifies To Erase, i. e. To *Un-Stand*—To remove a thing from its *Stand*, *Seat* or *Position*. The Greeks have a compound from their Ist*emi*, (Ιστημι,) To Place—Stand, &c., which at once means to *Place* and to *Un-Place*, if I may so say, To Erect, Build, &c., and To *Erase*, *Destroy*, &c. *An*-Ist*emi*, Ανιστημι, in one sense means "Exstruo, Ædifico," and in another, "Everto, Subverto."

The adjacent word to *Os*, *Ossis*, is Os, *Oris*, which must be referred to the idea of the *Extremity;* and this sense of the *Extremity* is derived from that of the Surface, considered either as the Base or Bottom, or the *Top*. R. Ainsworth explains Os in some of its senses by "The Face or countenance of any "creature.—The *Front* of an army.—The Mouth, Passage, or "entrance into any place.—The Head or Fountain;" where, in the '*Head* or *Fountain*,' we see the idea, as of the *Base*—*Foundation*—Orig-*in*, from which any thing arises. The genuine notion of the word is that of the *Surface*—*Extremity*, at which any thing ends or begins. We see, in the oblique cases, the form *Or*, as in *Oris*, &c., which will remind us of the adjacent word Ora, "A Coast, region, part, or country—*Extremity*, "edge, brim, margin, hem, or border of any thing;" where in the sense of *Extremity*, annexed to Ora, we see the true idea of *Os*, Or-*is;* and in that of the "Coast, *Region*," &c., we are brought to the original Spot, from which these terms are derived. The Phrase "*Oræ* vulneris, the *Lips*, or edges of "a wound," as explained by R. Ainsworth, might have been equally Ora vulneris, or Os vulneris. Oro, "To Speak"—Pray, &c. belongs to *Os*, Or*is*, as the Lexicographers imagine,—who

who likewise justly observe, that *Oraculum* belongs to *Oro*, Dico, *Ore* pronuncio, as Λογιον does to Λεγω.—We see by my explanation of *Ora*, how it is connected with *Orior*, " To have a beginning." Ostium, " A Door.—An entrance, or passage.—The Mouth of " a river or haven," belongs probably to Os, as the Etymologists suppose. If it does not, it belongs to House, &c., under a similar idea of the *Establishment*, &c. &c. Os*culum* is justly derived from Os, and Os*cito* from Os and Cito, Moveo. The adjacent words, *Ostendo* and *Ostento*, are imagined by some to be taken from *Ob* and Tendo; or from Os and Teneo, i. e. Teneo ob oculos. They seem to be derived from Os, and perhaps *Tendo*, and to relate to the Extended or Widely-exposed *Surface*, to the *Extremity*—or *Outside* of any thing, as we express it.

We have seen, that in Arabic, اس AS signifies " A Foundation, " Basis. The *Heart* of Man (as being the Foundation of life,)" &c. Perhaps the explanatory word, the English Heart, and the parallel terms to be found in other Languages, have the same idea. The Heart of any thing, of *Oak*, &c., means the Solid Substantial part of it; that which is the *Main* support and *Foundation* of the Tree. The word *Substantial*, which precisely expresses the idea annexed to Heart, is derived, we know, from *Sto*, which belongs to the race of words before us. *Substantia* is acknowledged to be derived " à *Substando;*" and *Substo* Robert Ainsworth explains by " To Stand still, to bear up, to Stand his " Ground." In the phrase " To Stand his *Ground*," we are brought to the original Spot, and genuine idea, from which, as I imagine, these terms are derived. Heart occurs in various Languages, as the Saxon Heort, the Gothic *Hairto*, the German *Herz*, the Danish *Hierte*, the Belgic *Hert*, the Runic *Hiarte*, &c. Some derive these words from *Kear*, *Keer*, *Kardia*, (Κηρ, Κεαρ, Καρδια,) or from *Eetor*, (Ητορ,) and others from *Hard*, Durus. Surely *Cardia*, (Καρδια, Cor,) must belong to *Heart;* and *Cordis* we

we shall own, I think, to belong to *Cardia*. We shall then agree, as I imagine, that *Cor*, *Ceer*, and *Cear*, (Κηρ, Κεαρ,) must be referred to each other. The Greek EETor, (Ητωρ,) ought surely to be considered as belonging likewise to HAIRTO, &c. &c., and thus all these terms are attached to each other. These words however present considerable difficulties. The verb attached to those terms, as the English HEARTen, and the Saxon HYRTan, "Refocillare, animare, confortare," &c. may be the original, and may belong to the race of words, which signify To *Stir up*—*Excite*. If this should be the case, HEART, and HART, the animal, may belong to the same idea. The HEART is the seat of boldness—that which is *Stirred up* or *Excited* to deeds of valour; and the HART is the *Stirrer* up—the *Exciter*—the Annoyer,—Pricker or Pusher, with his Horns—the animal, which HURTS. The preceding term to *Hyrt*an, Refocillare, &c. in my Saxon Dictionary, is "HYRT, HURT, Læsus, Vulneratus." Still however I must observe, that the name for the HEART is commonly taken from the idea of that, which is *Solid* and *Substantial*. In the Ægyptian Language, ATH or ETH is the *Heart;* and hence the Capital of the Delta was called ATH-*Ribis*, Cor Pyri. "Nempe," says Bochart, "Ægyptiis Aθ vel Hθ est Cor, ut scribit Horus "Hieroglyphicôn, lib. i. cap. 7. et Ριϐ, vel Ριϐι, Pyrum; inde "*Athribis* Cor Pyri, quia in medio Pyri, id est, Ægypti partis, "quam à Pyri forma Ægyptii *Rib*, id est, Pyrum, vocabant." (Geograph. Sacr. p. 259. Ed. 1707.)

We have seen, that the Arabic As, اس not only signifies the *Foundation*, Basis, and the Heart; but it means likewise "The Earliest Age, Eternity.—The *Cinders* or *Ashes* remaining "*in a fire-place*." In Arabic, likewise, under the form ^RS, ارث ARS, or IRS, not only means "Inheritance, Heritage, Here-"ditary right.—A Root, stability, firmness, the principal part, "any thing agreeable to ancient hereditary custom;" but it signifies

signifies likewise "*Ashes.*—*The Remains,* Residue;" and we cannot doubt, I imagine, that the Arabic ARS and AS are only different forms of each other. The senses of HERIT*age,* the *Root,* and *Ashes,* unequivocally bring us to the EARTH. The Arabic ARS and AS, in the sense of Ashes Remaining in the Fire-Place, bring us to the English HEARTH, and the Greek EST*ia,* (Εστια, Focus, Lar;—Domus;—Ara;—Asylum;—*Vesta,* Dea;—Sedes v. gr. Imperii.)—In *Estia,* (Εστια,) as I before observed, we unequivocally see the original idea of the *Base*—*Foundation*—*Seat,* as connected with the Ground, or EARTH, or, when the *r* is lost, EATH. We may observe, likewise, how EST*ia,* (Εστια,) connects itself with the adjacent term EST*en,* &c. (Εστην,) belonging to IST*emi,* (Ιστημι,) as it ought to do, according to my hypothesis. Whether ASHES and its parallel terms belong to *Estia,* (Εστια,) the Base or Bottom, as of the EARTH, on which they lie, or to the *Dirt* of the EARTH, I cannot decide.—The sense, which the Arabic word bears, of "The Earliest *Age,* "*Eternity,*" is taken from the idea of that which *Lasts*—*Continues*—or *Endures,* as things do, which are Established on a proper *Base* or *Foundation.* The words containing this train of ideas will be considered on another occasion.—I shall examine in the next article a race of words, which signify, What is *Firm*—*Substantial*—*Stout*—*Strong,* derived, as I imagine, from the idea of that, which is *Firmly Established,* as on a *Base* or *Foundation,* &c. The same Radical idea still remains, however various may be the purposes, to which it is applied.

Terms

Terms signifying what is *Firm —Substantial, Stout—Strong;* derived originally from the idea of that, which is *Firmly Established,* &c., as on a *Base* or *Foundation,* &c.

OJ. (Hebrew.) To Fix, make Firm, or Steady, A Tree, the Back-bone.

Ost*eon,* Os. (Gr. Lat.) A Bone.

O*zos.* (Greek,) The Knot, or Branch of a Tree. What is Substantial.

Oak — Ac — Eik — Eiche — Eyck. (Eng. Sax. Run. and Dan. Ger. Belg.) The Firm Substance.

Ast. (Germ.) A Branch.

Asts. (Goth.) Ramus.

Atsatjan. (Goth.) Sistere.

OZ. (Heb.) To be Strong, vigorous. Strong Cities, Garrisons, Holds.

Is. (Gr.) Strength, A Fibre, Nerve.

Iskus. (Gr.) Strength, Power.

Vis. (Lat.) Force, Strength.

O*gan.* (Irish,) A Bough, Twig, Branch.

O*gain.* (Ir.) A Young Man.

Eo*gan.* (Irish,) The name *Owen.*

Og. (Ir.) Young.

Oig. (Ir.) A Champion.

AZ. (Arab.) Rare, Excellent, *Corroborating.*

OZ, &c. (Chald. Syr. Samar. Æthiop.) Strong, &c.

Eus. (Gr.) Good, Stout, &c.

Eith-*eos,* Aiz-*eos,* &c. (Gr.) A stout Young Man.

OZ-UZ. (Heb.) Very or exceedingly Strong.

Hizz-Uz. (Syr. Chal. Arab.) Dominus Fortis.

Az-Iz. (Phœn.) Mars.

Hes-Us. (Celt.) The God of War.

Aid — Aider, &c. (Eng. Fr.) The Firm Support.

Aosseo. (Gr.) To *Assist.*

Assa, Ass — Asinus, Athn, &c. (Sax. Eng. Lat. Heb.) The Bearer — Supporter.

ATN. (Hebrew,) Strong, as a Fortress.

ISD. (Heb.) To Found, Establish.

IZA. (Heb.) To come forth or out.

out. To Arise, as from a Base.

IDH. (Heb.) The Hand, the Member of *Strength.* — A *Pillar*, &c. &c.

Axis, Axon, Ex, Achs, Axis, Axle, &c. (Lat. Greek, Sax. Germ. Eng. &c.) The *Main Substantial* Part, on which a thing is *Founded*—*Upheld*, &c.

Achsel — Esl. (Germ. Sax.) The Supporter.

Assis — Asser. (Latin,) The Board—what is Substantial, Solid.

Æs. (Lat.) A Pound—the Solid Substance.

The Greek Oz*os*, (Οζος, Nodus arboris, Ramus,) the Knot of a Tree—Bough—Branch, &c., must be referred to the idea of what is *Strong*—*Substantial*—*Firm*, &c. The Oz*os Areos*, (Οζος Αρηος,) is supposed to be Απογονος, the Descendant, the Branch or Shoot of Mars, as it were. If it does mean so, it connects itself perhaps in this case with the more original idea of the word. Perhaps, however, the Oz*os Areos*, (Οζος Αρηος,) means nothing but "Columen belli." Ast in German signifies "A Branch, "Arm of a tree. Ein Ast in Holz, A Knast, Knob, Knur, "Knurl, Knot," according to the notable explanation of my Lexicographer. In Gothic, Asts is "Ramus,"—Ats*atjan*, Sistere, and Ats*tandands*, Adstans. In Hebrew, עצה OZH or OJH signifies, says Mr. Parkhurst, "To fix, make firm, or steady.—"As a N. עץ" OZ or OJ, "A Tree, from its *fixedness*, stability "or firmness." This word likewise means the *Back-Bone*, "from "its *Strength* and *Firmness*." To this word Mr. Parkhurst justly refers the Greek Oz-*os*, (Οζος,) to which he might have added the Latin Os, Oss*is*, and the Greek Ost-*eon*, (Οστεον.) In the First Chapter of Genesis we have עץ פרי OZ PERI, which means "A Tree of Fruit, A Fruit Tree;" from whence Mr. Parkhurst has derived the name of the *Gardens of the Hesperides*, Hes-Peri-*des*.

This

This conjecture is consummately ingenious; but I fear, that it is not the true derivation. The explanation of this point would open into a wide field of discussion.

The Hebrew עצם OZM denotes, says Mr. Parkhurst, "Strength, "Substance, Solidity, Firmness.—A Bone, from its Strength and "Solidity," where OZ in OZ-ZM may perhaps belong to the race of words before us. The two preceding terms to this word are עצל OZL, "To be slothful, idle, to loiter," where OZ in OZ-ZL has probably a similar idea of *Stability;* and OZ, "To "Fix,—A Tree." The two succeeding terms are עצר OZR, "To restrain, retain, stop, detain;" and עק OK, "To Confine, "straiten, contract, compress," where we have a similar idea of *Fixing.* As a Noun, מעקה *m*-OKH means "A Battlement round "the roof of a House, to confine people from falling off." Here the word recurs to its more original sense of *The Erection—Establishment,* &c. Mr. Parkhurst derives OAK from this term, "and perhaps *Yoke.*" We shall instantly agree, that OAK belongs to this race of words, and means the *Strong—Firm* Wood; as Robur, we know, means this species of Tree, for the same reason. OAK occurs in various Languages, as the Saxon *Aac, Ac,* &c., the Runic and Danish *Eik,* the German *Eiche,* and the Belgic *Eyck,* &c. Lye observes truly, that the Saxon word Ac not only signifies *Quercus,* but *Robur,* Strength, as *Robur* itself has this double meaning; and he accordingly derives these words from *Alke,* (Αλκη, Robur.) If he had derived *Ilex* from this Greek word, he would have approached more nearly to the truth. The *Acorn,* with its parallel terms *Accæren, Accorn, Æcern,* (Sax.) *Aggern,* (Dan.) is derived from AAC, the OAK; but whether the *Corn* be significant in *Ac-Corn,* as denoting *Granum,* which Skinner supposes, I cannot decide. In German it is *Eychel, Ecker;* in Belgic, *Aker, Eechel;* and in Greek, *Akulos,* (Ακυλος,

Glans quercus,) which are produced by the Etymologists, and which all belong to the OAK.

In Mr. Shaw's Galic and Irish Dictionary we have *Ogan*, "A Bough, Twig, Branch." The succeeding article to this is *Ogain*, *Oganach*, *Oigair*, "A Young Man." In the same column we have "OG. Young. OGH. A Virgin. OGH. Whole, Entire. "OGH. OGHA. Pure, Sincere;" which are derived probably from the more complete state of the frame in health—vigour, &c. during youth. I find likewise in the same column "OGHA. "A Grandchild. *Oglach*. A Servant, a Youth, soldier, vassal. "*Ogmhart*. A Heifer, a Young Beef. *Ogmhios*. June. *Ogri*. The "Youth, Young, young men;" and in the next column, "OIG. "A Champion;" and "OIGE. Younger." In the Irish Language, "All nouns ending in *Og* and *Eog* are of the feminine gender," (Vallancey's Gram. p. 60.) and in Galic, "All diminutives of the "feminine gender end in *Og* or *Ag*." (Shaw's Gram. p. 101.) These terminations might belong to OGH. The Virgin, or Young female; or they may be referred to the Element ^G, denoting Being—*This* or *That* Being, by way of Distinction, whether under the idea of exaggerating or lessening. To this race of words, OGAIN, The Twig, or Young Man, belongs the Celtic name *Owen*. In the Irish and Galic Dialects we have EOGAN, which Mr. Shaw explains by "*Owen*, the name of several great "men in Ireland." The terms preceding and succeeding this in Mr. Shaw's Dictionary are "*Eochair*. A young plant, sprout;" "*Eoghunn*, Young;" and in the same column we have "EOCHA. "Name of a Man, Lat. Euchadius," and "EOCHAIR. Brim, "Brink, Edge," where, in the sense of the latter word, we are brought to the original idea of the Extremity or Base.

The Arabic عز Az signifies in the first sense, according to Mr. Richardson, "Rare, excellent, precious, incomparable, "honourable,

" honourable, glorious, powerful, great;" and in another sense we have " *Corroborating.*" The original notion is that of *Strong, Corroborating;* and hence it denotes any Excellent quality in general. To this idea we should perhaps refer the Greek Eus, (Ευς, Bonus—Strenuus.) The idea of *Goodness* would be derived from the quality most regarded in the ancient world, that of *Strength;* and hence we learn, that the original sense of the word was that of *Strenuus.* In the Ευς τε μεγας τε, we see the primitive notion of the word. The Greek Ax*ios*, (Αξιος, Dignus, &c.) might be derived from the same idea; though I have annexed to it a different notion in another place.—The Greek names for a *Youth* or vigorous *Young* Man, Aiz*eos*, (Αιζηος, Juvenis, qui *Robore* juvenili viget,) Eith*eos*, (Ηιθεος, Adolescens, Juvenis,) Azoi, (Αζοι, Servi, Servæ,) Ais-*ueter*, (Αισυητηρ, Adolescens valde robustus,) should perhaps be referred to the idea of *Strength*, as attached to this race of words. The Lexicographers, among other conjectures, refer Ais*ueter*, (Αισυητηρ,) to Aisso, (Αισσω, Ruo, cum impetu feror;) and it is certain, that the terms denoting Youth may be naturally derived from the idea of a *Violent* or Impetuous Motion. I have produced some of these terms in another place, among words impregnated with this train of ideas, that the Reader may form his own judgment on the question. Az*o*, (Αζω, veneror, colo,) may belong to Az*oi*, (Αζοι,) Servants. Perhaps the Homeric word Aiet*on*, (Αιητον,) Πελωρ Αιητον ανεστη, which the Scholiasts explain by Μεγα, may have originally been derived from the idea of what was *Stout—Substantial.* On this, however, I cannot decide. In Theocritus, Ait*es*, (Αιτης,) occurs as a Thessalian word for a Youth, who is the object of Love. It seems simply to have meant *The Youth.*—The name of the Grecian Chief, *Aias*, (Αιας,) may belong to this race of words, under the idea of the *Stout Warrior.* It may perhaps be quasi *Ajas*, as in Latin *Ajax;* and the word may be a compound, as Aj-As, Aj-Ax, where the Element

Element ^J may be doubled, in order more strongly to convey the idea. This mode of increasing the force of a term perpetually occurs. Again, in Hebrew, עז OZ, with ז *Zain* for the second letter, and not צ *Jaddi*, as in the former word, means "Strength, "Vigour, To be Strong, Vigorous, To prevail." This word perpetually occurs, and it is applied to *Strong Cities—Garrisons—Holds*, &c. (Isaiah xxvi. 1. xxiii. 11. xvii. 9. Prov. x. 15. Dan. xi. 19, 39. &c.) Mr. Parkhurst refers the Latin Os, and the English *Ox*, to this term; which may be so, though I have given a different idea to this latter word in another place. Mr. Parkhurst imagines, that the name of the Goat, עז OZ, belongs to this radical, to which he refers likewise the Greek Aix, (Αιξ,) though Taylor arranges these Hebrew words as different Roots. The Aix, (Αιξ,) might be placed among the race of words, belonging to our Radical, which denote *Agitation or Motion*. Mr. Parkhurst observes under עז OZ, "As a N. masc. plur. "מעזים" *m*-OZ*im*, "Protectors, *Defenders, guardians*, mentioned "as objects of worship. Dan. xi. 38, 39. So Eng. margin at "ver. 38. *God's Protectors;*" and he derives the Hercules of the ancient Gauls, called *Magusan*, from this source. To the race of words now before us, denoting Strength, as עז OZ, &c., we should perhaps refer the Greek Is, Isk*us*, (Ις, Fibra, Nervus;—Robur, *Vis*, Ισχυς, Robur, Vires, Potentia,) the Latin Vis, &c.

In Hebrew, the עז OZ is doubled for the purpose of expressing more forcibly the idea, which it contains. Hence עזז OZZ signifies, "To make *exceedingly* strong, strengthen *very much*—עזוז" OZUZ, "Very or exceedingly strong." To this combination Bochart has attributed the name of the God of War among the ancient Gauls, Hesus—"Horrensque feris altaribus Hesus," and the Syriac Aziz-*os*, (Αζιζος.) "Hesus cur putetur esse *Mars* "disce ex Gallorum veterum historiâ, quam ante aliquot annos "edidit Antonius Gosselinus ὁ μακαριτης in hâc ipsâ Academiâ, "professor

" professor eloquentiæ. HESUS proprie fortem sonat, ut Hebræis " עזוז HIZZUZ, et Syris, Chaldæis, Arabibus, עזיז HAZIZ. Sic " vers. 8. Ps. xxiv. ubi Deus dicitur esse *Dominus fortis et potens*, " *Dominus potens in bello;* Dominus fortis Hebraice est יהוה עזוז " *Jehova* HIZZUZ, et Arabice אלרב אלעזיז Arrabbo-lHAZIZO. Inde " Marti factum est nomen etiam apud Phœnices. Quod ex " Jamblicho docet Julianus Apostata Oratione in Solem. Verba " sic habent. Ετι μετριασαι βουλομαι της Φοινικων θεολογιας, &c. Οἱ την " Εδεσσαν οικουντες ἱερον ἐξ αιωνος ἡλιου χωριον, Μονιμον αυτῳ και Αζιζον " συγκαθιδρυουσιν, αινιττεσθαι φησιν Ιαμβλιχος, &c. ὡς ὁ Μονιμος μεν Ἑρμης " ειη, AZIZOΣ δε Αρης. Volo adhuc è Phœnicum Theologiâ nonnihil " depromere, &c. Qui Edessam habitant locum ab omni ævo " Soli sacrum, *Monimum* et HAZIZUM una cum Sole collocant, " quod sic Iamblichus interpretatur, &c. ut Monimus quidem sit " Mercurius, HAZIZUS autem Mars." (Geograph. Sac. p. 662.) In Mr. Shaw's Galic Dictionary, AGH is " A conflict, battle;" and AGHACH, " Warlike, Brave." HESUS may possibly belong to this latter word, but on this I cannot decide. The Element ^Z denotes *Strong* in the Chaldee, Syriac, Samaritan, Æthiopic, and Arabic, as appears by the parallel terms produced in Castel under the Hebrew עזז OZZ. In Arabic, the corresponding terms are عز Az, produced above, and عزيز Az-EEZ, " Excellent, Precious," &c. Mr. Parkhurst refers *Hesus* to the Hebrew עש OS, " To " consume, destroy." He observes, however, that it occurs not as a verb in the simple form, but as a compound עשש OSS, " To be consumed, consume, or waste away," I have referred this Hebrew word in another place to a different idea. Perhaps the Greek *Agerochos*, (Αγερωχος, Superbus, Ferox,) may be a similar compound of AG-OCH.

The Abbé *Caperan*, in his Observations on the *Exurgat Deus*, (the sixty-ninth Psalm,) has produced various names for *God;* some of which are to be referred to the race of words now under discussion;

discussion; as the Armenian *Astuadz*, the *Iez-Dan* of the Zendavesta, (p. 92.) the *Isten* of the Hungarians, (p. 96,) &c. He derives the *Astu* in *Astuadz* from the Hebrew אש AS, Fire; and *Adz* from אוד AOD, "Principe, Producteur;" so that the compound expresses "Feu Principe, Feu Producteur." The *Iez* in *Iez-Dan* he derives from the same source of אש AS or *Esh*, Fire; and *Dan* he refers to the Hebrew אדן ADON, "Base, Fondement, "Principe;" so that both these words convey the same idea of "Feu Principe." The derivation of *Dan* is, I imagine, just; and Abbé Caperan has seen likewise, (p. 89.) that the Hebrew אדן ADN belongs to the English *Down*. This is well conjectured, as the terms are somewhat remote. Mr. Parkhurst, who is a bold Etymologist, has not observed this under דן DN, which he justly considers as the Root. The Abbé has moreover produced, as a derivative, the Greek Dun-*amis*, (Δυναμις, Potentia,) which I believe to have a similar origin. The Abbé might have been reminded of the Arabic دون Dawn or Dun, "1. Base, "Mean, Inferior, ignoble, despicable. 2. (è contra) Noble, "Excellent." Here we have both senses, naturally belonging to the same idea of the *Ground*, as the *Base*, &c. The Greek Essen, (Εσσην, Rex,) belongs to the form Iezdan, &c. In Zen, (Ζην, Jupiter,) we have only the Element ZN, or DS-N, &c. This will bring us to King, and its parallel terms in Modern Languages, and to Khan, the title of dignity in the East. We now see, why, in the Eastern Languages, Khan is the House and the Prince; as *Arche*, (Αρχη, Principium, Fundamentum, Principatus,) relates at once to the *Building* and to *Power*. In AST-UADZ we see the same compound as in Hizz-Uz, AZ-IZ, &c. The *Iezdan* coincides with אדן Adon, Adon-*is*, the Lord, the Chief, as connected with Adon, the Base, precisely by the same metaphor as *Arche*, (Αρχη, Principium — Fundamentum, Principatus, Imperium,) relates to the Base and to Power. The

Isten

ISTEN of the Hungarians is only another form of IEZDAN; and to these must be referred ODIN, the Hero, or the Deity of the North. The Abbé *Caperan* has properly seen, that ISTEN belongs to Is*temi*, (Ιστημι,) *Stare;* though he is not right in supposing, that the Hebrew " שות *Shouth*, Placer, Etre stable," is connected with these words. The Hebrew SUT belongs to the Element ST, to *Sedes*, *Sisto*, &c. &c.

The Abbé Caperan observes, moreover, that ISTINNO signifies, in the Russian Language, *Truth;* and he justly connects it with IST-*emi*, (Ιστημι,) and with the idea of Stability. *Istinno*, *Isten*, *Iezdan*, *Adon*, &c., all belong to each other under the same idea of the *Base*—the Spot of *Establishment*, *Settlement*, &c., and are connected with IS*temi*, (Ιστημι,) *Stand*, &c. &c., as I have before explained. The Abbé remarks, likewise, that ESHEM השם is a Rabbinical name for God, which he derives from the Hebrew חסה *Ese*, confiance; and that *Odel*, or *Ozel*, is a name for the Deity " chez les Zingiens, peuples qui habitent une large contrée " de l'Ethiopie," which he considers to be a compound, and derives from " עז OZ, force; d'ou le Grec ις, le *Vis* des Latins; " et de אל AL, Dieu." ESHEM השם belongs to the Hebrew עצם OZM, " Strength, Substance, &c., A Bone," and the Arabic *Azym*, عظيم " Great, Large," عظم AZM, A Bone, YZEM, Magnitude, عظام *Yzam*, Bones, &c., terms so familiar to that Language. The AZ in AZ-ZM should probably be referred to the race of words now before us. Among the Cabalists, ATH את is the name of God, which Bochart conceives to have been formed from א A and ת T, the first and last letters of the Hebrew Alphabet, according to the idea in the Apocalypse, " I am *Alpha* and " *Omega*," &c. (Geograph. Sac. c. 745.) The preceding term to *Yzam* in Mr. Richardson's Dictionary is عظاظ Yz-Az, which he explains by " 1. Biting one another. 2. Vehemence, intrepidity " in battle," where we have a similar compound to that in

HIZZ-

Hizz-Uz, &c. The Oz in *Ozel* belongs probably to these words. On the second part of the compound we cannot decide, as the Elements ZL and ^L have a similar meaning. When the sound of Z is lost in the Element ZL, it becomes ^L. Among the Æthiopians, Agza אגזא signifies "Seigneur," as the Abbé informs us; and this he derives from גזא GZA, Tresor, to which he refers the Latin *Gaza*, and the English *Cash*. The Hebrew GZA &c. belongs to the Element GZ. The Agza must be referred to the race of words before us.—The Turkish title, the Aga of the Seraglio—Janissaries, &c. belongs, I imagine, to the same stock. Mr. Richardson observes under the Persian اغا "Agha, "(or *Aca* in the *Mogul* and *Khouasmian* dialect,) A great Lord, "nobleman, head, chief master, commander." Again, among the Magi, as the Abbé observes, Orsi signifies God; and this he refers to the Hebrew ערץ Orts, Fort, and the Greek Ares, (Αρης.) On the origin of the term Orts I can decide nothing; but I have referred, on another occasion, the Greek and Hebrew words to a different idea. *Orsi* he conceives to be *Osiris*, but this is not so.—Menage has produced the Turkish word Aga, "Seigneur;" though he has given no derivation of its original meaning. The succeeding word in his Dictionary is Aga, an interjection of *Admiration* and *Astonishment* among the French, which some have derived from the Greek *Agao*, (Αγαω, Demiror.) The Aga of the French—the Ag*ao*, (Αγαω,) and Ag*ios*, (Αγιος, Sanctus,) of the Greeks, might belong to this race of words, under the idea of what is *Excellent* or *Exceeding* in *Strength*—*Power*, &c. &c.; but on this I am unable to determine. Without the history of the word nothing can be done. The French Aga seems to belong to *Ach! Ah!* &c. &c. Some of these words must be referred to the terms denoting Being, *This*, or *That* Being, by way of eminence; which I discuss fully in another part of my Work.

The

The succeeding words to the Hebrew עז OZ, in Mr. Parkhurst's Lexicon, are עזב OZB, "To leave," עזק OZK, "To Surround "with a fence," and עזר OZR, "To help, *Aid*, Assist." The sense of *Leaving* is derived from the idea of that which *Remains*, where we see the sense of *Stability*, or of being Fixed in a certain Spot. The *Fence* is derived probably from the notion of what is *Firm — Secure*, &c. The sense of *Help*, *Aid*, and *Assistance*, at once connects itself with the idea of *Strength*, &c.; though it is difficult to decide, whether OZR עזר belongs to the Element ^Z or to ZR. One sense of the word directly brings us to the idea of the *Establishment*, *Erection*, &c. It is interpreted by our Translators, in one of its meanings, by *Court*, and, in a similar use of the word, by *Settle*. Taylor supposes it to be, in one case, "A square work raised above the pavement, with a parapet "round about it, and a door in the parapet, before the altar of "burnt-offerings. Upon this elevated square stood Solomon's "pulpit. 2 Chron. vi. 12, 13." He adds, "But in Ezekiel, "where we translate it the *Settle*, it is, I apprehend, the Benching "in round about the sides of the Altar of Burnt-Offerings, both "the higher and lower benching in, upon which the Priests "walked, when officiating about the sacrifices. And both these, "the elevated square, and the benching in, might take their "names from this root, as they gave *Help* or Advantage to those "that stood upon them." In both these cases it is translated in "Latin by *Atrium;* and we shall at once agree, that the ATR in ATR-*ium* belongs to OZR עזר &c. Festus defines ATR*ium* to be "Genus *ædificii* ante ædem," where we are brought to the idea of the *Establishment* or *Erection*. Some derive it from *Ater*, black, "quòd *Atrum* esset ex fumo;" — others from *Aithrion*, (Αἰθριον,) "Subdiale," — from *Etruria*, or from *Terra*, "quia à "Terrâ oriatur." In *Ater*, Black, we are brought to the Dirt of the Ground. This word probably belongs to the Element

TR, to *Terra*, &c. In Saxon, *Eder*, *Edor*, and *Heder*, signify "Sepes, Septum, Tectum." *Edor* is explained by "Domus." These words appear to belong to ATR*ium;* and to the same form we should probably refer the Greek ECHUR-*os*, and OCHUR-*os*, (Εχυρος, Munitus, Firmus, Tutus, Οχυρος, Munitus, Firmus,) Fortified, Firm, &c. To the Hebrew עזר OZR belongs אזר AZR, To Surround, Encompass,—עטר OTR, To Encompass, Surround,—אטר To Obstruct, Shut. The Latin HEDER*a* means, perhaps, that which *Surrounds*, or *Entwines*. Under the form ^CR, ^GR, ^TR, &c. we have the Latin and Greek *Ager*, *Agr-os*, (Αγρος,) the English *Acre*, with its parallel terms *Æcer*, *Æther*, (Sax.) &c. &c. In the same column of my Saxon Dictionary, where we have *Æcer*, *Æcr*, Ager, we find likewise ÆDDRA, "*Vena*, "Fibræ, rimæ, fissuræ;" which, with the German *Ader*, I have supposed to belong to this race of words, denoting an *Enclosure*—the *Enclosing* Hollows for the blood.

Under the same form, ^DR, we have the Hebrew הדר HDR, which signifies, according to Taylor, "Honor, gloria; honorare. "Glory, honour, majesty, splendor, beauty;" which must be referred to this race of words, under the idea of an *Enclosure*. These senses of the word seem very remote from this notion; but a little consideration will establish my conjecture. Mr. Parkhurst explains the first sense of this word by "To Adorn, Decorate, "Deck." Here we are brought to the original idea,—that of *Encompassing*, *Surrounding*, *Covering*, in the explanation of To *Deck* or *Decorate*, as with the Covering of garments. The very explanatory word *Deck* is acknowledged by the Etymologists to be derived from the German *Decken*, Operire, Vestire, and the Latin and Greek *Tego*, *Stego*, (Στεγω); and I shall shew in another Volume, that *Decorate*, *Decus*, *Decor*, *Deceo*, belong likewise to *Deck*. We have seen, that the Saxon *Heder* is explained by-"Septum, *Tectum*," the Enclosure; where we have in *Tectum* a derivative

a derivative from *Tego*. The Hebrew הדר HDR belongs to עטר To Enclose, Sepire, and signifies *Tegere*, To *Deck*. In short, the Hebrew הדר HDR I consider as the verb, *Tegere*, To *Deck;* and the Saxon *Heder*, as the substantive. To the Hebrew הדר HDR, To Adorn, Decorate, Deck — Glory, Honour, Majesty, "Splendor, Beauty," must be referred another Hebrew term, אדר ADR, which Mr. Parkhurst explains by "To be or become "magnificent, pompous, illustrious, glorious;" and to which he justly refers the Greek ADROS, (Αδρος,) "Great, rich, strong," as he explains it; and the Latin *Adorea*, "Glory, praise, renown." This Hebrew word is used in its genuine sense, when it denotes, as a noun, "A magnificent *Mantle* or *Robe;*" and sometimes simply a *Garment*, as the Hairy *Garment* of Elijah, (1 Kings, xix. 13.) The idea of a *Magnificent* or *Glorious* appearance is perpetually connected with that of a *Garment* or Covering. We all remember, in the Hundred and fourth Psalm, "Bless the Lord, "O my soul. O Lord my God, thou art very great; thou art "*Clothed with Honour and Majesty. Who coverest thyself with* "*light as with a garment.*" The word translated by Majesty is הדר HDR, the term produced above, where we see it connected with the very idea of *Clothing* or Covering, which I conceive to be the original notion. The word translated by *Honour* is הדה HDH, which might be referred to our Element, under the same idea. This word, however, has considerable difficulties. The term translated by *Coverest*, עטה OTH, belongs likewise to our Element, and contains for its original idea the sense annexed to this race of words. This term עטה OTH, "To throw or wrap "as a garment over one," is adjacent to עטר OTR, "To *En-* "*compass, Surround,*" produced above; and the words in Mr. Parkhurst's Lexicon, which we find between these terms, are עטן OTN, the Bowels, where OT and ^TN are both perhaps significant, and mean the Base or Lower Part; עטף OTP, "To

"Obscure,

" Obscure, *Cover*, cloke, hide," which means, we see, To *Enclose*. I have before expressed a difficulty respecting the words under the form ^TR; and have observed, that the Element TR denotes likewise an *Enclosure*. Whatever we may think of the Element TR, the words עטר OTR and עטף OTP shew, I think, that the ^T is significant. If the TP and TR are likewise significant, these words are compounds.—Under any hypothesis respecting the origin of these terms belonging to the form ^TR, we shall at least agree, I imagine, that they all belong to each other. The Saxon HEDER, Septum, must however surely connect itself with the adjacent term HEDan, To Heed, Cavere.

Let us note, in the explanation of the Hebrew word produced above, the term AID, which must perhaps be referred to our Element ^D, under the idea of the *Firm Support*, as attached to what is *Fixed—Established*, &c. The explanatory word *Assist* belongs to the same metaphor of *Standing* up. AID is referred by the Etymologists to the French *Aider*, the Italian *Aitare*, or *Ajutare*, the Spanish *Ayudar*, the Latin *Adjuto*, *Adjuvo*. In Italian, *Ajutante* signifies " Stout, robust," and *Aitante* means " Cou- " rageous, vigorous." We have likewise in the Italian Lexicons an adjacent term, AJO, the Tutor, which signifies the AIDER or Assistant. I find likewise another adjacent term to these words, AJA, " A Threshing-floor;" which brings us at once to the Ground or EARTH, &c., from which I imagine all the words, now under discussion, to be originally derived.—I find still another adjacent term, A*juolo*, a Net; which refers more directly to the idea of an *Enclosure* or HEDGE. The Latin *Adjuto* may not belong to *Adjuvo*, but to the race of words now before us. Casaubon derives the French *Aider* from the Arabic *Iad*, signifying the *Stand;* and others refer it to the Syriac *Adar*, a term of the same import. Perhaps the AUX in *Auxilium* may have the same meaning, and is not derived from *Augeo;* unless AUG*eo*, and

and *Aexo*, *Auxo*, (Αεξω, Αυξω,) are taken from the same source. In the Greek Aosseo, Aoss-*eter*, (Αοσσεω, Auxilior, Αοσσητηρ, Auxiliator,) we have the idea of Help, in its simplest form. The Lexicographers derive these words from ανευ οσσης, "nec omine, "nec augurio aliquo impulsus, sed sponte." In Arabic, نضر *n*-Ezir signifies "Assistance, Victory;—An Assistant;" a term which perpetually occurs in that Language. The *N* in this form may be the addition from the construction of the Language; or it may have arisen from the sound of the first letter, as in Hebrew, עזר OZR or *g*NZR. In Arabic, *Hysar* حصار signifies "A For-"tified Town, a Castle.—A Fence, an Inclosure." Again, in Arabic, حرز Hyrz means "Fortification, a garrison town, a castle, "a place of refuge." The succeeding word is حرس Hers, "An Age.—Heres. The King's Guards."

I have before produced Asts, (Goth.) Ramus; and in the same opening of Lye's Saxon and Gothic Dictionary, where the word Asts occurs, we have the Gothic Astaths, Veritas, Certitudo indubiæ veritatis, which is derived from the idea of what is *Established—Firm*, &c. The preceding term to this in Lye is Ast*andan*, "Durare, *Stare*, Manere, *Subsistere*," and *Astellan*, "Statuere, Stabilire, firmare." In the same page we have Assa, Asinus, Asina, *Assald*, Asellus, the Ass; and we shall now understand, that the name of this animal is derived from a similar idea of the *Supporter—Sustainer—Bearer—Carrier*, &c. This idea has been ever connected with the same animal. Some have derived *Asinus* from *Sedeo;* others from עזל OZL, Pigrescere; and some from the Hebrew אתון *Athon*. The Greek Onos, (Ονος,) has been referred to *Asinus* or *Asnus* by the loss of the *S*. In the Hebrew אתן ATN, we have the genuine idea. It denotes, says Mr. Parkhurst, "Strong, like the Bones. Job xxiii. 19.—Strong, "as a fortress—as the *Foundations* (inner part of the Shell) of "the *Earth*. Mic. vi. 2." where we are brought to the original Spot.

Spot. This word means likewise " A She-*Ass*, from her passive " strength." The TN and SN in the Hebrew אתן ATN is significant, as in אדן Adon, the Pillar, &c., Astan*dan*, &c. &c. before produced.

The Hebrew עץ OJ is joined with יסד ISD in the Psalms, viii. 3. יסדת עז ISDT OJ, Fundasti Fortitudinem. The Hebrew יסד ISD signifies " To Found, lay the Basis or Foundation." It is a compound of IS and SD; the latter of which Elements appears through a great variety of Languages with a similar meaning, as in *Sisto*, *Sedeo*, *Sido*, &c. &c. The succeeding word in Mr. Parkhurst's Lexicon is יסך ISK, which he explains by " To *Smear over*," and which seems remote from the train of ideas now under discussion. It occurs only once in Exodus, (xxx 32.) where it is interpreted by *Pour*.—" Upon man's flesh " shall it not be *Poured*." The word seems precisely to correspond with the English *Put*, and the Latin *Pono*, *Posui*, &c. " Upon man's flesh shall it not be *Put*;" where in *Put* we see the idea of *Place* or *Position*. The next word is יסף ISP, interpreted by " To Add, Increase," which seems likewise remote from the present train of ideas. This Hebrew word is only another form of ישב " To sit, sit down—To Sit down, Settle, " to fix one's abode, or dwell in a place,"—of יצב IJB, " To set, " settle, place steadily or firmly, in a certain situation, or place, " Statuere, Constituere;" and of ישם Is*m*, " To Place, Set, Put." They are compounds of IS and SM or SB, bearing the same meaning. The succeeding word to ישב ISB is יש ISH, which denotes " *Existence*, Subsistence, Reality,—Is, are, was, were," &c. &c. The word יסף ISP, To Add, seems to mean nothing but *Pono*, *Appono*, To *Put to*. It is curious, that the word is sometimes interpreted in our Translation by To *Put* to. " Nothing can " be *Put* to it, nor any thing taken away." (Eccles. iii. 14. See also Numb. xxxvi. 3. 2 Chron. x. 11.) The succeeding word

word is יסר ISR, which signifies "To restrain, check, discipline." Here again we have the sense of the Element 'To make to Rest, 'To Fix,' &c. The succeeding word is יעד IOD, To Appoint, "*Constitute.*" An adjacent term is יעז IOZ, which signifies "To "Strengthen." The next word is יעט IOT, "To Cover," which belongs, I imagine, to the *Base*, as the Superficial Covering, or to the idea of *Putting on*, as we express it. We all know, that Eso, (Εω, Εσω, Colloco, Εω, Εσω, Induo,) relates in Greek both to *Placing* and *Cloathing*, or that it means To *Put* and To *Put on*. Hence we have Esthes, (Εσθης, Vestis, ab Εω, Colloco;) and thus we see, how Esthes, (Εσθης,) connects itself with the adjacent word Estia, (Focus, Lar,) the Hearth—the Ground, and *Vestio* or *v*-Estio with *v*-Esta, the Goddess of the Earth.

A word similar in form to *Esthes*, (Εσθης,) the Garment,—Estho, (Εσθω,) signifies To *Eat*. Nothing appears more remote from each other than the ideas annexed to Esthes, Estho, and Estia, (Εσθης, Εσθω, Εστια,) the Garment, the action of *Eating*, and the *Earth;* yet we shall soon understand, how readily they are connected together. I shew in another place, that Estho, (Εσθω,) and Eat, belong to Estia, (Εστια,) under the idea of Tearing up—Scratching upon, or Fretting upon a *Surface*, as of the Ground—the Estia, or Earth; and Esthes must be referred to the same Spot, under the idea of *Placing* or *Putting* one thing *on* another, as on a *Base* or Superficial Ground. Another form of the Hebrew יעט IOT is עטה OTH, before produced, which Mr. Parkhurst has explained in one sense by "To throw or wrap, "as a garment, over one;" and in another by "To *Put* a Covering "upon, To Cover," which again refers, I imagine, to the *Base*, as the *Superficial Covering*, Enclosure, &c.; or To *Put* or Place on, To Cover, &c. It is idle in many cases to attempt to separate the idea of the *Base*—considered as the Bottom—the *Extreme Surface*, *On* or *Upon* which any thing is *Placed* or *Put;* and

and that of *Placing* or *Putting* one thing on another, as on a *Base.* The explanatory term *On* may serve as an illustration of the matter, as it conveys at once the notion of the *Base*, *On* which things are Placed or Put; and likewise that of a *Covering*, as connected with this *Placing* or *Putting*, as To Put *On* your cloaths. In short, I imagine that these various words are derived from the *On*, if I may so say, as the *Base*; and that they signify either To *On*, if I may thus express myself, that is, To *Place On*, *Put On*, referring to an Establishment, or To *Place On*, *Put on*, referring to a Garment. I shall shew in a future Volume, that *Cover*, *Super* and *Sub*, belong to each other. *Cover* and *Super* we acknowledge to coincide in sense with each other. In *Cover* we see but little of the idea of the *Surface;* but in *Super*—the *Superficial* Covering, it becomes manifest. We see, how *Sub* and *Super* belong to each other under a different idea. The next word is עטן OTN, "The Bowels, Intestines," which Mr. Parkhurst supposes to mean *Involutions*, and to be derived from עטה OTH, To Involve, or *Cover.* This term for the Belly means the *Lower Part*, as belonging to the Base or Foundation, and must be referred to the form of אדן ADN, the Pillar. This idea I am enabled to confirm by the Arabic word, which Castell has produced, as parallel to עטן *OTN.* The Arabic word is عطن ATEN, which Mr. Richardson explains in one sense by "The *Bottom* or "*Base* of a Mountain."

An adjacent term to the Hebrew words יעט IOT, &c. is יעץ IOJ, "To advise, give counsel, advice, or information." This too seems remote from the ideas which are now before us; yet the original notion is probably that of *Settling*—*Arranging* as plans—schemes, &c. Taylor has brought us to the idea of *Placing*, when he explains the word by "To *Lay* a scheme, to "form a design." In Judges, xix. 30. we have "Consider of it, "take *Advice*, and speak your minds," where the Hebrew word

in

in question is here translated by *Advice.* We perceive, that *Consider of it* has a similar meaning to *Take Advice;* and we may observe, that the term for *Consider*, שם SM, belongs to the same metaphor of *Place.* Mr. Parkhurst explains שם SM in the first sense by "To *Place, Set, Put,*" and, in another sense, "To *Lay* "*up*, i. e. in mind, Reponere,—To attend to, consider;" and the Septuagint combines the two parts "*Consider of it, Take* "*Advice,*" in one phrase, "*Place—Put*—or *Lay* Counsel;"—"Θεσθε "ὑμιν αυτοις βουλην επ' αυτην, και λαλησατε." The same Hebrew word יעץ IOZ is used with זם ZM in Isaiah xxxii. 7. "He *deviseth* "wicked *Devices.*" Mr. Parkhurst explains זם ZM by "To "devise, imagine, think." This זם ZM is only another form of שם SM, and signifies "To *Place,*" &c. The sense of ZM זם will be manifest from the next term in Mr. Parkhurst's Lexicon, זמן ZMN, which he explains by "To *Appoint, Constitute,*" and in Chaldee, "To prepare, or perhaps to devise, from Heb. זם" ZM. The ZM and SM in these Hebrew words bear the same Elementary form and meaning as SM, SB, and JB, in ישם ISM, ישב ISB, and יצב IJB, before produced.

An adjacent term to the Hebrew יעץ IOZ is יצא IZA, "To "come or go forth or out, in almost any manner," says Mr. Parkhurst; "Exire, Egredi, Prodire," says Taylor. Here we are brought to the idea, with which I commenced, ORIGO, *Orior,* ORTus, To proceed, as from some ORIGinal *Foundation* or *Source.* The idea of *Foundation,* as it relates to Strength, does not appear; but that of *Source* only is to be found. This Hebrew word conducts us to the Spot, from which, as I conceive, all these terms have been derived. "It is applied, inter al.," says Mr. Parkhurst, "to the productions of the EARTH or of Vegetables." Mr. Parkhurst has justly referred to this Hebrew term the English Iss*ue,* "by which word," says this writer, "our translators render "the verb יצא" IZA, "Isa. xxxix. 7," &c. "And of thy sons,

" that shall Issue from thee." In this application of these terms, the Hebrew IZA and the English Issue coincide with the sense of the Welsh Ach, " A stem or Pedigree; the lineage of one's " ancestors."—" Ach is used for *Merch*," A Daughter, &c. Issue has been justly referred to the French *Issir*, *Issue*, the Italian *Uscire*, and the Latin *Exire*. Isser means in French " To *Hoist* " *up* the sails," that is, To cause to *rise forth*, or *Up*. It should seem, as if the word Hoist belonged to *Isser;* and yet Hoist seems to be annexed to High, &c., which I have referred to a different idea. After having proceeded thus far, we should at once admit, that the Latin Ex and the English Out belong to this race of words, and are derived from the Earth, as denoting the Base, Foundation, or Source. The Ex *eo nati* of the Latins are those, who are born from him, as being the *Base—Foundation—Stem*, &c., *Source*—Ach, (Welsh,) &c. In such words as Ex*truo*, *Existo*, *Exist*, we see Ex in its more primitive use. The Latins used *E*, Ec, and Ecs, for Ex; and the Greeks, we know, have Ek and Eks, (Εκ and Εξ.) *Extra* means Ex *Terra*, which directly brings us to the Spot, supposed in my hypothesis. Out occurs in various Languages, as the Gothic *Us*, *Ut*, *Uta*, *Utana*, the Saxon *Ut*, *Uta*, *Utan*, the German *Aus*, the Belgic *Uit*, *Uyt*, *Wt*, the Islandic and Runic *Ut*, the Islandic *Ud*. To Out belongs Utter, with its parallel terms *Ytter*, (Swed.) *Ytre*, (Isl.) *Utter*, *Yttre*, (Sax.) &c. There are however some difficulties respecting the word Out—Ex, &c. &c., which will be explained on a future occasion. We shall at least agree, that they are all ultimately derived from the Earth, as the *Place*, on which things are established; but whether they directly belong to this idea, will be then understood. In Persian, از Az signifies " From, of, for, " by, Out of, with." In the phrase از مساس Az *Musaus*, ' From the *Foundation*,' we are brought to the original idea of the word; and Az is connected with the term, to which we might suppose

suppose it to belong, اساس As-As, the Foundation.—In Hebrew, יצק IZK signifies "To pour, pour OUT." Taylor compares it, in some of its senses, with another Hebrew term, צוק ZUK, which signifies "To *Set* fast—Consistere, Collocari, Firmari, Durescere." This latter word may belong to the Element SK, to *Sisto*, &c., or it may belong to the race of words before us, by the loss of the Vowel breathing before the S, quasi ISK. The preceding term to יצק IZK is יצג IZG, which signifies "To Place, Set, or "leave in a certain Situation or condition." One of the passages, in which יצוק IZOK occurs in this doubtful sense, is the following, where the word is interpreted by *Molten*. "Iron is taken out of "the Earth, and brass is *Molten* Out of the stone." (Job xxviii. 2.) The idea annexed to *Molten* may be taken from that of *Pouring* OUT—*Fundendi*—Æs, as the Latins have it, or as we have it, from the opposite idea of *Founding*, *Fundandi*, or making Firm and Solid, as in *A Brass-Foundry*. Robert Ainsworth explains *Fundo*, To *Pour Out*, in its ninth sense, by "To Cast Metal, "to *Found*." The succeeding word to יצק IZK, To pour out, is יצר IZR, "To form, fashion, shape, model to a particular shape." In one passage, Taylor explains it by "I will form, raise, "*Establish* thy Kingdom," &c., where, in the word *Establish*, we see the genuine idea. The adjacent words are יצת "To burn, "or be burned, as fuel;"—יקד IKD, "To Burn, as Fire." The latter term signifies "A HEARTH," which may be the original idea annexed to both these words. An adjacent term is יקר IKR, "To be bright, splendid, shining," which may be derived from the Fire on the HEARTH; but on this I cannot decide. The succeeding term to this last word is יקש "To *Lay*, *Set*, or spread, "as a snare or toil," where we have the genuine idea.

The Hebrew Scholars will now be enabled to understand the origin of the familiar term in that Language for the *Hand*. Mr. Parkhurst explains ידה by "To Cast, cast forth, cast OUT—To "Put

" Put or hold forward, or forth, either by the voice, or some " overt act, to profess, confess, openly or freely." This seems to be only another form of יצא IZA, " To Come or go forth or " *Out.*" The word likewise signifies The *Hand* of Man, " so " called," says Mr. Parkhurst, " from its being naturally capable " of being protended or thrust forth from the body.—And since " the *Hand* of Man is the chief organ or instrument of his *Power* " and *Operations*, hence the Hebrew יד ID is used in a very " extensive manner, for *Power*, *agency*, *ability*, *means*, *instru-* " *mentality*, *dominion*, *possession*, *assistance*, *custody*." As the *Hand* would supply the idea of *Power*, &c., so I imagine, that this was the original notion from which it was derived. The Hebrew ידה IDH denotes, as I conjecture, *Strength—Firmness*, as derived from the *Base* or *Foundation*, on which things Rest, and from which or *Out* of which they *Proceed*, or arise. Hence, ידה IDH signifies " To Cast, cast forth, cast *Out*;" though this sense may be likewise connected with the action of the *Hand*. The word denotes " A Side, border, extremity;" because " the *Hands* are " placed on each *Side* of the Body," says Mr. Parkhurst. Hence, as the same writer observes, an " *Extensive Country* is said to be " רחבת ידים" RChBT ID*im*, " Wide of Hands, i. e. Wide on " all *Hands* or sides, as we say." We see, that this Hebrew word, in the sense of a *Side—Extensive country*, is employed in its original idea of a certain *Place—Situation*—Spot of Earth. I shall shew, that the word *Side* belongs to a similar idea—to *Sido—Situation*, &c. &c. This word means " To put or hold " forward, or forth, either by the voice or some overt act, to " profess, confess, openly and freely, whether as an object of " *Praise* or Worship." In this sense it precisely corresponds with Utter, which is derived, as we know, from Out. There is another Hebrew word, הדה HDH, which Mr. Parkhurst has compared with ידה IDH, and which signifies " To send, thrust,

" or

" or dart forth:—Glory, Majesty, Honour.—To Glorify, Honour, " Praise," that is, To UTTER Praises, &c. This word however has its difficulties. The Hebrew ידה IDH means, moreover, " A Trophy or Monument of Victory, probably," says Mr. Parkhurst, " because made in the shape of a large *Hand* (the emblem " of *Power)* erected on a *Pillar.*" In the sense of a *Pillar* we see the original idea of some thing *Set up, Established,* &c., as on a *Base or Foundation.* It is expressly referred to a *Pillar,* as Mr. Parkhurst has justly observed, in the following passage. " Now Absalom in his life-time had taken and reared up for " himself a *Pillar,* which is in the King's dale; for he said, " I have no son to keep my name in remembrance; and he " called the *Pillar* after his own name: and it is called unto this " day, Absalom's Place." (2 Sam. xviii. 18.) The term, which is translated by *Place,* is יד ID; and we perceive, that *Place* coincides with my idea of the word; which I imagine to signify 'To Place, Settle, Establish, Fix, &c.' The term for a *Pillar* is מצבת *m*ZBT, and for *Reared,* יצב IZB, " To Set, settle, place " steadily or firmly, in a certain situation or Place." I have shewn, that the IZ in IZB belongs to the race of words now before us. The term for the Pillar, *m*-ZBT, is derived from this. In Arabic, يد ID is the Hand. The Hebrew יד likewise means " Axle-Trees, q. d. Handles for Wheels."

Let us note the explanatory word *Axle,* and remember its corresponding terms in other Languages, the Latin *Axis,* the Greek *Axon,* (Ἄξων,) the Saxon *Æx, Ex,* the German *Achs, Achse,* the Belgic *As, Asse, Axe,* the French *Essieu, Assieu,* the Italian *Axo, Assile,* and the Spanish *Exe,* the Welsh *Echel,* &c. The Ax*is* means the *Main—Substantial* Part, on which the Instrument is *Founded—Upheld—Supported.* Some derive Ax*is* " ab *Ago,* " *Axi.* ant." The story of IXION and his Wheel has arisen from a confusion of terms in the name *Ixion* and *Axon,* (Ἄξων,) the

Axis

Axis of a *Wheel.* Ixion seems to mean the *Illustrious* personage, and to be the same as Adon-*is*, אדן Adon, Isten, Iezdan, &c. &c. The succeeding word to the German Achs, Achse, the *Axel*-tree, is Achsel, the Shoulder, which surely belongs to the same idea as the Axis or Axel, and means the *Supporter*—Bearer. In Saxon, Esl is Humerus. In the same column of my Saxon Dictionary is *Esol*, Asinus, where a similar idea is found. The succeeding word to *Esl* is Es*n*, "Adolescens, Juvenis: Vir, "Masculus: Servus;—Plebs." The *n* perhaps in this word is only an organical addition to the *S*. The ES may denote the Strong, Stout fellow, or it may belong to the general name for *Being*, Is, Est, &c., which I shall shew to be derived from the idea of what is *Placed*—*Situated*, or Is. The use of this Saxon word coincides with that of the Hebrew איש AIS, Man, (Gen. xxiv. 61. xlii. 11—13. Exod. ii. 1.) which belongs to the verb ישה ISH, denoting "Existence, Subsistence, Reality.—Is. Are, "Was, Were." The Saxon *Esne* is likewise written *Æsne*, which occurs in the same page of Lye's Saxon Dictionary with Æsc, Fraxinus, the Ash. Whence this term is derived, I know not, unless it be taken from the idea of what is *Stout*—*Strong*. In some states of this wood, it is considered as a *Firm Substance*. Spears would not have been made of it, unless this had been the case. Among the Greeks, we know, this wood was used for Spears, (Μελια, Fraxinus;—Fraxinea Hasta,) and so it was among the Saxons; (*Æsc* Fraxinus. Scutum et Hasta à materiâ.) The word Æsc likewise means in the *Edda*, "Homo primus, ex Frax-"ino quem dii condidêre." This fable of the first man being made of Ash arose from a confusion in the terms for Ash, the Tree, and for *Man* or Being, איש AIS, ÆS*ne*, Is, (Eng.) His, (Eng.) Is, (Lat. and Goth.) the *Man*, &c. &c. &c. The *Esn* among the Saxons was placed in the lowest rank of their Social Orders, as we use *Man* for Servant. Ash occurs in various Languages,

Languages, as in the Saxon *Æsc*, the Danish *Ask*, the Belgic *Esch*, the German *Esche*, *Eschen*-Baum, An *Ashen* Tree, &c. Skinner wonders, that the *Hellenists* do not derive this term from the Greek Αυω, Accendo, because the wood is an excellent Burning wood. If an idea of this kind be annexed to the word, the Ash might be referred to its adjacent term Ashes—as being readily reduced to this state. Æsc means in Saxon, "Dromo, Navigium, "liburna," probably from being made of Ash; and to this has been referred the term for Pirates, Asco-*Manni*, Æsce-*Men*. Junius has justly observed, that since Ash was used for Spears, hence Soldiers were called by Cædmon, Asc-*Berende*, Ash-*Bearing*.

The Latin and Greek Ax*is* and Ax*on*, (Αξων,) mean the Boards, on which the Laws were engraved. These might be so called from the idea of their turning round, as upon an Axis; but they probably refer to the original idea of the *Board*—the *Substantial* object. The Laws of Solon were said to have been written *Axibus ligneis;* and some have thought that *Axibus* is put for *Assibus*. We shall now understand, that Ass*is* and Ax*is* are only different forms of each other, and that Ass*is* or Ass*er* means nothing but the *Substantial* object—Firm—Solid Timber. Ass*is*, and As, the Pound weight, &c., have the same meaning of the *Substantial* Object. The Etymologists have derived As from Æs, Æri*s*, which perhaps may be taken from a similar notion. Æs might be the *Substantial—Solid* Metal—"Æs *Grave*," as it is called; though it is probably taken from a different idea. We see in the *Ær* of *Æris*, that the *S* has been changed into *R*. Perhaps Æra, the Period of Time, may be quasi Æsa, and mean *Duration*—that which *Lasts*—*Endures*. Thus then *Æra* or Æsa will agree with Age, Æta*s*, to which I attribute, in another place, a similar idea. Some Etymologists derive *Æra* from *Æs*, *Æris*, "quòd Hispani post cladem à Calvino acceptam Romanis

"*Æra*

" *Æra* persolverent." In Mr. Shaw's Galic and Irish Dictionary, IRIS is " An Æra, Epoch," where we have the full form of the Element; and in the same column of Mr. Shaw's Dictionary we have IRIS, Brass, where we see likewise the full form. In German, Brass is ERTZ, which means the Mineral or EARTH. The Celtic IRIS and the Latin *Æs* belong probably to the same idea. The other senses of IRIS I must leave the Celtic Scholars to unravel. In the same column of Mr. Shaw's Dictionary, where these words occur, we have " IRE, Ground, Land," which is probably quasi *Irs*. In the same column we have *Irionn*, " A " Field, Land, Ground." Perhaps *Iron*, and its parallel terms *Iren*, *Isen*, &c. (Sax.) *Jern*, (Dan.) *Eisen*, (Germ.) *Iiser*, (Belg.) *Eisarn*, (Goth.) *Haiarn*, (Welsh,) &c., produced by the Etymologists, may simply mean the EARTH or Mineral, or it may mean the *Firm Strong Substance*. We see in Eis*en*, &c. the true form ^S. Mr. Richards, under the Welsh word, produces the parallel terms in other dialects of the Celtic, as the Cornish *Hoarn*, the Armoric *Houarn*, and the Irish *Iarann*. The preceding terms in Mr. Shaw's Galic Dictionary to *Iarrunn* and *Iarunn*, Iron, are *Iarram*, " To Ask, seek, look after," and *Iarrum*, " To Ask, seek, " look for, enquire," which mean To Stir up the IRE, " the Ground, " land," or EARTH. We shall not wonder to find terms denoting *Search* and a Metal adjacent to each other, when we remember, that the very words, to which Metal belongs, *Metallao*, (Μεταλλαω, Scrutor, inquiro,) means To Search, Enquire, &c.

Ass*us*, the adjective, means in one sense, " Without mixture, " Alone, Pure," which might have been explained by the Pure *Substance* of any thing, unmixed with foreign matter—*Assa* Caro—the mere *Substance* of Flesh. Ass*us* however may belong to terms, denoting *This* or *That* Peculiar Being—Thing, as Is, HIC, HEIS, (Εἷς,) &c. &c., fully illustrated in another place; as in the explanatory term *Al-one*, we have *One*, meaning *This* or *That*—Peculiar

Peculiar—Single Being or Thing. The sense of Roasting, annexed to these words, is taken from another idea. *Assa*, the Hypocaustum, belongs to *Assus*. While I am examining this word in Martinius, I cast my eyes on an adjacent term, *Asser*, which among the ancient Latins signified 'Blood.' This word belongs to the Element SR, as I shall shew in another Volume. The notion, which I have attributed to Ass*us*, will explain to us, why the adjacent word to it is AST, which signifies in one sense, says R. Ainsworth, "Surely, truly,"—what Is so. "Bellona, "si hodie nobis victoriam duis, AST hîc ego templum tibi voveo." —The old Latin word Ax*are*, Nominare, is supposed to be derived "ab more eo *Axibus* inscribendi leges." The sense of *Naming* may be derived from the idea of *Placing*—Arranging, &c. The Hebrew term for *Name* is taken from the same notion, as we have before seen in שם SM, which means "To *Place*, *Set*, "*Put*," and "A *Name*, an articulate sound, which is *Placed* or "substituted for a thing, as its sensible mark or sign," says Mr. Parkhurst. The old Latin word Ax*amenta* or Ass*amenta*, "Verses, songs, or hymns, sung by the Saliar Priests at Hercules's "sacrifices," as R. Ainsworth explains it, is derived by some from AXARE, Nominare, and by others from *Assare*, which is explained by "In unum solum hominem poëma condere." ASSA, "A Dry Nurse.—A Midwife or Nurse, that tends women lying "in," is derived from Αζω, Sicco, from *Assum*, "quòd *Assint* iis "quos nutriant;"—from *Assus*, Merus, "ut quarum simplex "esset cura valetudinem ac munditiem tuendi, non item lactandi;" or from *Atta*, Ατται, "Εστι δε το μεν Τεττα φιλου, το δε Ατται τροφεως, "Το δε Παππα πατρος, το δε Ηθεις αδελφου."

In Welsh, ASER and ASERW mean "A Table, a Board or "Plank," and ASTELL is "A Board, a Plank." The preceding term to *Aser* is *Asen*, "A Rib," which may be taken from the idea of the *Planks* or Supports of the Sides. An adjacent term

is A*sethu*, " To bind, to fasten;" to which belongs the preceding word ASETH, " A sharp pointed lath or spar to *Fasten:* A Wagget; " also a Wedge, saith R. M." This latter word means the *Fastener—Compresser.* The Wedge has two actions, that of Splitting some parts by *Compressing* others. In the same opening of Mr. Richards' Dictionary, we have ASSIO, the same as IASSAU, " To Solder or Sodder, to join, fasten or glue together," ASU, " To join," and ASWR, " One that joineth or addeth." We find likewise in the same opening, and next to ASTELL, " A Board," ASTAL*ach*, " A Shield," which seems to be only another form of *Astell*, the Board of Defence—the *Substantial Firm* Instrument of Defence—Security. The Welsh Lexicographers justly produce another term in that Language, " AES, A shield, a buckler, " a target;" and under this word we are referred to the Greek As*pis*, (Ασπις, Clypeus,) where the As probably belongs to the same idea, the *Firm* Defence. Whether the *Pis* in this word is significant, I cannot decide. Perhaps the *P* is only an organical addition to the *S.* The Welsh Etymologists imagine, that *Astalch* is derived from *Aes*, The Shield, and *Talch*, Broken, " Such as that of a brave soldier is wont to be." This must be settled by the adepts in that Language.

The English word OATH, and its parallel terms *Ath*, (Sax.) *Aith*, (Goth.) *Eed*, (Belg. and Dan.) *Eid*, (Germ.) *Eidur*, (Run.) might be derived from the idea of that, which is given to make any thing *Firm—Secure*, &c. These words do not, I imagine, directly belong to the ORKOS, (Ορκος, Juramentum,) which I have derived from a similar sense, though it is annexed to a different race of words. I cannot help producing a strange coincidence between OATH and the EARTH; though, if they are connected in this case, it is not by the intermediate notion of *Firmness* and *Security*, which I have here suggested. In *Richard* II., the Lord, in throwing down his gage, as a pledge to fight with Aumerle,

as

as Percy had engaged to do in a former speech, "There I throw "my Gage," says,

"I task the EARTH to the like, forsworn Aumerle." (Act IV. S. 1.)

In one Copy, for *Task* we have *Take*, and Dr. Johnson reads, "I take thy OATH;" on which Mr. Steevens observes, that there is a similar corruption in *Troilus and Cressida*, 4to, 1609, where we have "Untraded EARTH" for "Untraded *Oath*." The passage in *Troilus and Cressida* Mr. Malone writes thus:

"*Hect.* O, you, my Lord? by Mars his gauntlet, thanks!
"Mock not, that I affect the untraded *Oath;*
"Your quondam wife swears still by Venus' glove,
"She's well, but bade me not commend her to you."
(Act IV. S. 5.)

The Quarto, 1609, reads,

"Mock not thy affect, the untraded EARTH."

These passages are very curious. In the first instance, "I task "the EARTH to the like," the reading EARTH is certainly right, and probably means, 'I impose the same task on the EARTH in 'having my Gage thrown upon it, as Percy has done by throwing 'his Gage.' In the latter passage the mind of the Poet is occupied by the same train of ideas, the *Gauntlet* and the *Glove* of Defiance; and here too the word EARTH is adopted. I do not understand the meaning of the latter passage; yet we must own, I imagine, from this coincidence, that EARTH is the true reading. Mr. Steevens has quoted a curious line from Warner's *Albion's England:*

"Lo, here my gage, (He *Terr'd* his glove,) thou know'st the victor's meed."

To *Terre* the glove, as he supposes, was to dash it on the *Earth*. This is certainly curious; though we cannot as I suppose, imagine, that *Oath* was connected with the EARTH under this idea. I must add, however, that the Gothic AITHS, Juramentum, occurs

occurs in the same column of Lye's Saxon Dictionary with the Gothic AIRTHA, Terra. In the same column we have the Saxon AITH*an*, Eliminare, Exterminare, which means, I imagine, To EARTH out, or to drive out from a certain EARTH or Place. We have likewise the Gothic AIST*an*, Revereri, and the Gothic AITHEI, Mater. Whether AIST*an* belongs to the name for a *Mother*, I cannot decide.

Certain words denoting *Kindred*, derived from the idea of the *Base — Foundation — Stem — Stock*, &c.

ATTA — ATHAIR — OZHA, &c. &c. &c. (Greek and Goth. Ir. Scl., &c. &c.) Father.

AITHEI. (Goth.) Mother.

AI'THA. (Goth.) EA'TH.

ACH. (Welsh,) A Stem, or Pedigree, a Daughter.

ICS. (Heb.) To number by Families.

ACC. (Chald.) To Join, connect, consociate.

AC. (Heb.) A Brother. — A *Hearth*.

ACA — ACH. (Syr. and Arab.)

AIC. (Gal.) A Tribe, Family.

AICE. (Gal.) A Prop.

AICDE. (Galic,) A Building, Foundation.

AIGHE. (Gal.) A Beam, Prop:— Stout, Valiant.

AC. (Gal.) A Son.

UIOS. (Gr.) A Son.

ACA-*Damh*. (Gal.) An

ACA-*Demy*, &c. Where *Sons* or Youth receive Learning.

IN Gothic, as we perceive, AITHEI is Mother; and in the same Language ATTA is Father. We shall see, in the progress of these discussions, that the name for a Father belongs to the Element ^T, through a great variety of Languages; as in the Greek ATTA, (Vox, quâ juniores Senes appellant, sodes, Amabo, Pater, Lat. ATTÆ, Senes,) the Irish ATH*air*, the Sclavonic

OZHA,

OZHA, &c. &c. We shall all agree, that the name of Father and Mother would naturally be connected with the EARTH, as the Source—Base or Stock—from which things arise, and on which they are Fixed and Established. We perceive, that the similar forms, AITHA, Terra, and AITHEI, Mater, conduct us to this union of ideas.—These points however will be more fully discussed in the succeeding pages, where I examine a race of words, denoting *Existence*, which I shall shew to be connected with the idea of what is *Placed—Situated* or Is, precisely by the same metaphor, which is found in the word *Existence*, from *Ex* and *Sisto*.—I shall here only produce certain terms, denoting *Being*, as a *Son—Family*, &c., which are acknowledged to be directly involved with the metaphor of the *Base*—or *Foundation—Stem—Stock*, &c.

In Welsh, ACH is "A *Stem* or Pedigree, the lineage of one's "ancestors;" and ACH is used for *Merch*, A Daughter. The Welsh Lexicographers refer us to the Hebrew יחש ICS, which Mr. Parkhurst explains by "To reckon up, number or distribute, "according to families or genealogies." These Lexicographers ought likewise to have referred us to the term אחח ACC, which, says Mr. Parkhurst, "occurs not as a V. in Heb., but in "Chaldee denotes To *join, connect, consociate;* and in Arabic the "cognate verb אחי" ACI "signifies To *bind*, fasten by binding; "vinxit, vinciendo nexuit."—As a noun, אח AC signifies "A "person *connected* or *consociated* with us in whatever manner, "A *Brother* by nature—A Relation, Cousin,—A Countryman—"A *Sister*." The same word means likewise "A *Hearth*,—"Εσχαρα,—A little altar," which Mr. Parkhurst thinks to be a kind of "Brasier or Portable Machine to *Keep* fuel *together*." In Syriac ACA, and in Arabic أخ ACH, is a Brother. We see, that the Hebrew אח AC means the HEARTH, as the *Base* or *Foundation* of the EARTH; and that AC, the *Brother* and *Sister*, &c., signifies

signifies what rises from the same Ach, (Welsh,) *Stock*, *Stem*. The preceding term in Mr. Parkhurst's Lexicon to אחח ACC, To join, connect, &c., is אחד ACD, or יחד ICD, which signifies "To Unite, Make one.—Also Compactly, *Firmly*, Wholly.—"As a N. אחד" ACD, "One, the first, a certain one." The Hebrew אחד ACD belongs to the terms for One, as the Arabic اهد *Ahd*, the Chaldee חד CD, the Syriac HD, the Æthiopic ACD, the Coptic and Sahidic *Houit*, *Houid*, the Gipsey *Yek*, the Persian یک *Eek*, the English *Ace*, with its parallels, the Greek *Eis*, (Εις,) &c. These terms may be considered as belonging to the words now under discussion, and likewise to a great race of words, to be found through the whole compass of Language, denoting Being or Existence, such as Is, Hic, (Lat.) It, (Eng.) &c. &c., which I shew to be derived from the idea of what is Established in a certain Spot—what is *Placed—Situated*—or Is.

The succeeding terms in Mr. Parkhurst's Lexicon to אחח ACC, To join, &c., are אחז ACZ, "To Catch, lay hold on."—אחר ACR, Behind, and את AT, "As a N. or Particle, In an "inclined posture." The difficulty about אחר ACR consists in determining, whether it belongs to the Element ^C or CR; and the same difficulty occurs in the Greek *Eskara*, (Εσχαρα, Focus.) Perhaps the ^C and CR may be both significant. The Hebrew את AT means what *Inclines* to the Low situation of the Earth. In the same opening of Mr. Parkhurst's Lexicon, I find אי AI, which I have considered to be quasi AJ, and which signifies "A Settlement, habitation," where we are directly brought to the idea of the Spot of *Ground*, on which a Person is *Established—Fixed—Settled*, &c. This word I have fully explained on a former occasion; and I have observed, that it belongs to the Celtic *Ai*, *Aoi*, quasi Aj, Aoj, signifying "A Region, tract, or territory.—"Inheritance of Land, Possessions."

In the same column of Mr. Shaw's Dictionary, where these words

words occur, we have AIC, "A Tribe or Family; nourishing, "desire," and AICE, "A Prop," which, we now see, belong to each other, and to the Welsh ACH. In the next column of Mr. Shaw's Dictionary I find "AICDE. A Building, Foundation," and AICRE, AIKSI, "Inheritance, Patrimony," where in the latter word we are unequivocally brought to the EARTH, ARK, &c. &c. In the next column we have AIGHE, "A Beam, Prop, a Hind, "a Hill.—Stout, Valiant." Mr. Shaw has divided the meanings of this word into three separate articles; but we perceive, that the leading idea is that of *Firmness, Strength.* An adjacent term to these is AIG, AT; and we see, that both the Celtic and English terms convey the same idea of the Spot, in which or AT which a person is *Placed—Situated,* &c. To be AT a spot is to be ATTED, as it were, or to be *Placed—Set* or *Settled* in *This* or *That* peculiar spot. In Mr. Shaw's Galic Dictionary, ACHA is "A Mound or Bank," denoting, as I imagine, the object, which is Established, as a *Firm Base,* against the action of Water, &c.; and the succeeding words are ACHAID, "An abode," and ACHADH, "A Field." In the same column with these words we have ACHD, "Case, State, condition," where in the term *State* we have the true metaphor belonging to the Galic word—the Condition, in which any thing is *Placed—Situated,* &c. In the preceding column we have Ac, a Son, which brings us to the Hebrew אח AC, and the Welsh ACH. The succeeding word to this is "ACA-*Damh,* Academy," where Mr. Shaw refers us to *Damh,* Learning. If such be its derivation, ACA-*Damh* is the place of Learning for *Sons,* or Youth, and *Akademeia,* (Ακαδημεια, sive Ακαδημια, Academia, gymnasium publicum Athenis.—Ab Ακαδημος, *Academus,*) the ACA-*Demy,* will then be of Celtic origin, and not derived from a personage by the name of *Academus,* as the Greeks have idly imagined.

ACHA. (Gal.) The Mound, or Bank.

AKTE—OCHTHE. (Greek,) The Bank or Shore—as the Supporting Mound or *Earth.*

AIK. (Arab.) The Sea-side, shore, coast.

OCHTHOS. (Gr.) The Shore: the Heap of *Earth.*

ACHTHOS. (Gr.) The Heap or Load of *Earth.*

OCHEO, (Greek,) To Sustain,—Carry.

OCHEUO. (Gr.) Admissarium Admitto, vel Sustineo, i. e. To Sustain, or Carry.

THE Greek AKTE, (Ακτη, Littus;—Farina, Fruges—Sambucus,) the Shore, may be referred to ACHA, "The Mound or Bank," as meaning the *Ground* or *Land* of the Shores or Banks, forming a Firm barrier or *Support* against the Waters. In the sense of *Farina, Fruges,* we are brought directly to this Spot, under the idea of what is the Produce of the *Ground.* Whence the sense of *Sambucus* is derived I cannot decide. Martinius tells us, under *Sambucus,* that the *Ebulus* is called Χαμαιακτη, "tanquam *Humilis* "Sambucus;" which would lead us to suppose, that AKTE, (Ακτη,) meant the Low or *Ground* Plant. In Arabic, AIK عيق is "The "Sea-side, the shore, coast." The Greek OCHTHE, (Οχθη, Ripa, Ora,) seems to be only another form of AKTE, (Ακτη); and in OCHTHOS, (Οχθος, Littus;—Terræ tumulus, locus editus, collis,) signifying the Heap of EARTH, we are again brought to the same spot. In the adjacent word OCHEO, (Οχεω, Veho, Porto, Sustineo, Suffero,) we see directly the idea of that, which *Bears—Supports* or *Sustains.* The term preceding this in my Greek Vocabulary, OCHEUO, (Οχευω, Admissarium admitto;—Coeo, Ineo, Subagito,) which is considered as a Root, is properly applied to the Female, and means the same as OCHEO, (Οχεω, Veho,) To *Carry.* *Ride* in

in English is applied to the Admissarius by the same metaphor. We see in Ocheus, (Οχευς, Retinaculum — Vectis seu pessulus; Lorum galeæ; Scrotum; ab Εχω,) how these terms connect themselves with Echo, (Εχω, Habeo, possideo, teneo, obtineo; — sustineo,) which I have shewn to belong to a similar idea, of the certain Fixed Spot — Place or Earth, on which a Person is Situated, or which he Holds or Possesses. I have shewn, that Ez-*omai*, (Εζομαι, Sedeo,) To be Seated — Situated or Placed, has the same relation to Echo, (Εχω,) that *Sedeo* has to *Possideo*. In the sense, which Echo, (Εχω, Sustineo,) has of To *Bear* or *Sustain*, we are brought to the idea of the *Base*. — The Greek Achthos, (Αχθος, Pondus,) may only be another form of Ochthos, (Οχθος, Terræ tumulus,) the *Heap of Dirt;* but on this some doubts might be raised. That the word is derived from the Ground I have no doubt; but I am dubious only on this point, whether its sense of *Annoyance* is to be referred to the idea of Weight. In the expression ΑΧΘΟΣ ΑΡΟΥΡΗΣ, (Il Σ. 104.) Pondus Terræ, the word is brought to its original spot. In Ogkos, (Ογκος, Tumor; — Moles, Massa, Strues, *Gleba Terræ;* — Pondus, Onus,) we are again presented with the primitive notion. In this term, however, we are brought to the form ^NK, and to a great race of words, under the same form; about the origin of which some important difficulties might be raised. — The term Ocheo, (Οχεω, Veho, Porto,) is referred by the Greek Lexicographers to Ochos, (Οχος, Currus,) which they consider as a Root. The Greek Ocha, (Οχα, Præ cæteris, Præcipue,) the intensive particle, "ΟΧ' αριστος," &c., may be derived from Echo, (Εχω,) as the Lexicographers suppose; yet it may relate more directly to the general idea of the *Base* — or *Foundation*, the *Chief* Main Support of any thing, as *Arche*, (Αρχη, Principium — Fundamentum — Principatus, &c.) denotes what is *Chief* from the same metaphor of the *Base*, or it

may belong to the terms denoting *Being*—*This* or *That* Distinguished Being or Object, by way of eminence.

The Greek Echo, (Εχω, Habeo, Possideo, Teneo, Obtineo;—Sustineo;—Resisto, Obsisto;—Cohibeo, Reprimo;—Cingo, Circumdo;—Habito, Incolo, &c.,) contains the various senses, belonging to the race of words, which I have before examined, and which I am now explaining. Echo, (Εχω,) signifies to Earth, or, under another form, Erch—To Possess a certain Spot or Place of Earth, or Ech, if I may so say. We perceive, that it signifies "Incolo, Habito;" in which it agrees with the Saxon verb Eard*ian*, Habitare, Incolere, belonging directly to Eard, Earth.—Echo, (Εχω,) in the sense of *Possideo*, is connected with Ez-*omai*, (Εζομαι, Sedeo,) the Appropriate Fixed *Seat*, or Spot, as *Possideo* itself is connected with *Sedes*—the *Seat*. We perceive, how Echo, (Εχω,) contains the sense of the *Seat*—or certain Possessed, *Fixed Spot*, under the idea of the *Base*—or *Firm Position*, when it signifies To *Sustain* or *Support*, *Sustineo;* and we again see the idea of *Firmness* or *Strength* in the sense of *Resisto*, *Obsisto*,—Cohibeo, Reprimo, &c. Let us mark the *Sisto* in the explanatory words 'Re-*Sisto*—Ob-*Sisto*,' where we have the same metaphor of the *Firm Seat*, or *Situation*. In the sense of *Cingo*—*Circumdo*, we have the *Appropriate*—*Fixed* Spot or *Possession*, under the idea of the *Enclosure*, as in Yard—Ward, &c. (Eng.) Erkos, (Ερκος, Sepes,) belonging to the form Earth. Echo, (Εχω, Cingo,) in the sense of the *Enclosure*, coincides more directly in form with Hedge, &c. The sense of *Proximity* is often derived from that of *Holding fast* any thing, or to any thing —of *Adhering* to any thing; and hence we have, as one of the meanings of *Echo*, (Εχω,) "Prehendo, atque prehensum teneo, "Adhæreo, Conjunctus sum alicui, loco, sectæ," &c.; and *Echomenos*, (Εχομενως,) is explained by "Proxime, Contigue." Hence we

we have the Greek Eggus, (Εγγυς,) and Agchi, (Αγχι, Prope, Juxta.) In the same opening of my Greek Vocabulary, where this latter word is, I find *Agcho*, (Αγχω, Neco, Strangulo, Suffoco, Fauces constringo; — Constringo, Coarcto quovis modo,) which is surely only another form of Echo, (Εχω.) This relation seems direct and inevitable. We must observe, however, that Agcho, (Αγχω,) or *Ancho*, according to the pronunciation of the Greeks, brings us to the Elementary form ^NK, &c., and reminds us of the words, under that form, bearing a similar meaning of *Holding—Grasping*, &c., as *Hank*, *Hang*, *Hand*, &c. These terms, under another point of view, appear to belong to the Element ^N, ^NK, and to constitute a race of words, distinct from that, which is now the object of my discussion. Those words, which appear under the form ^N, ^NK, &c., will be considered in another place. A term adjacent to Echo, (Εχω,) in my Greek Vocabulary, is *Echuros*, (Εχυρος, Munitus, Firmus, Tutus,) which would connect itself with Echo, (Εχω, Sustineo; — Resisto.) Yet the Element CR has a similar meaning. Perhaps the Ech and CR are both significant. The term *Ochuros*, (Οχυρος,) is only another form of *Echuros*, (Εχυρος,) which the Lexicographers understand. The Och in Och*uros*, (Οχυρος,) seems to connect itself with Ocheo, (Οχεω, Sustineo,) another form of Echo, (Εχω.) In examining these words, I cast my eyes on *Ochma*, (Οχμα, Retinaculum,) *Ochmazo*, (Οχμαζω, Detineo, contineo,) which are represented likewise by *Echma*, and *Echmazo*, (Εχμα, Retinaculum, Εχμαζω, Inhibeo.) To this form ^GM, ^CM, we should perhaps refer the Salaminian word recorded by Hesychius, Uggemos, (Υγγεμος, Συλλαβη. Οἱ Σαλαμινιοι.) The Greek Συλλαμβανω, Prehendo, from which the explanatory word Συλλαβη comes, has a similar meaning to Οχμαζω, Detineo.

Words

Words denoting the *Base* or *Foundation*, the *Surface*, &c. &c., considered either as the *Bottom*, or *Top*.

UACH*dar*. (Gal.) The Top, Surface.
UAS. (Gal.) Above.
UASAL. (Gal.) Noble, Well Born.
ASIL. (Arabic,) Foundation, Source, &c., Race, Birth, &c., Firm, Radical.
ACH-UCH. (Welsh,) Above.

IS. (Welsh,) Below, Under.
ISEL. (Welsh,) Low.
ISOS—ÆQUUS. (Greek, Latin,) Level, or *Equal* as with the *Ground*, Level, *Equal*, Alike in general.
ÆQUO. (Lat.) To "Level or Equal with the Ground."
ISO-*Pedon*. (Gr.) A Plain or Level *Ground*.
ÆQUOR. (Lat.) "A Plain or "Level Superficies. The "*Earth*."
EESSA—EETTA. (Gr.) The *Low* Spot, Bringing *Low*.
EES*saomai*. (Gr.) To be *Laid Low*, To be *Inferior*, Vanquished.
ESK-*atos*, UST-*eros*, UST-*atos*. (Gr.) The Lowest.
ESKARA. (Gr.) The *Hearth*, Base, &c.

IN Mr. Shaw's Galic and Irish Dictionary, UACH*dar* signifies "The *Top*, *Surface*, cream, *Summit*, upper part." In the same column of Mr. Shaw's Dictionary we have "*Ua*. From, of, "a descendant, grandchild, commonly in English written *O*, as "O'Connor, O'Neil, O'Brian." The *Ua* is quasi *Uach*, and belongs to Ac, (Gal.) A Son, ACH, (Welsh,) "A Stem, Pedigree, "the lineage of one's Ancestors," as derived from the same *Foundation*, *Stem*, *Stock*. We shall now understand the origin of the Greek UIOS, UIEUS, (Υιος, Υιευς,) where we have the true form; but in the oblique case *Uiou*, *Uii*, (Υιου, Υι,) the Radical consonant is

is lost, as in *Ua*, *O*, (Celtic.) Again, in Mr. Shaw's Dictionary we have UAS, "Upon, more than, upwards, above." The succeeding word is "UASAL. Noble, gentle, well born; Sir, "a gentleman." In the same column of Mr. Shaw's Dictionary we have "UCHD. The Breast, Bosom," meaning perhaps the *Upper* or projecting part. An adjacent word is UCH*dach*, "An "Ascent, steepness, *Stomacher*, *Breast-plate*." The next word to *Uchd*, Breast, is UCH, Oh! Alas! and these terms may belong to each other under the idea of *My Heart! Oh! My Heart!* *Uch* may be attached, however, to another race of words—to Interjections, under a similar form, which I shall consider in a future page. In the same column of Mr. Shaw's Dictionary we have another word "UATH. The *Earth*, Mould," which brings us to the spot, from whence I imagine these terms to be derived.

In the same page of Mr. Richards' Dictionary, where ACH occurs, we have ACH for UCH, Above, which means the *Surface* or Top; and in the same column we have Accw, "There, in "that *Place*," where we are brought to the idea of *Place*. The Welsh Accw has justly been referred to the Greek EKEI, (EKEI.) For the same reason that UCH means *Above*, when referred to the *Surface* of the EARTH, as the *Top*, so the Welsh Is, under another idea, means "Below, Under," as the *Base* or *Bottom*. Hence we have "ISEL, Low, mean, humble." The *Sel* belongs probably to *Solum*. In Mr. Shaw's Galic and Irish Dictionary we have Ios, which, as he tells us, is "For Sios, *Down*; *Anios* "and Sios, to and fro," and IOSAL, Low. In the same Dictionary we have IACH*dar*, "The Bottom, Foundation, lower part, nether." To the Celtic ISEL and IOSAL, *Low*, and UASAL, "Noble, gentle, "well born, &c., we must refer the Arabic ASIL, or ASL, اصل "A Cause.—Root, Origin, Principle, *Foundation*, Element, Source. "—Lineage, Race, Line, Birth, &c. &c.—Firm, Radical, Im-"moveable, permanent." The As in As*il* is derived from the Arabic

Arabic اص As, (the two first letters in اصل *Asil*,) which Mr. Richardson explains by "The Root, Origin, Foundation." Hence is derived اسلام Eslam, or Islam, "The *True* or orthodox faith, "among the Mahometans." The original sense of the word is that of well *Founded* or *Grounded*. Another meaning of the term is "Being in Health, peace, and safety." The two first letters of this word is اس As, or Uss, denoting "A Foundation, Basis," the very term, which has conducted me to this vein of discussion. The Arabic *Eslam* is Es-*Slam* or *Salam*. To *Slam or Salam* belongs the familiar term of Salutation among the Arabs, سلام Selam, "A Salutation.—Peace, Safety.—Saluting, Wishing "Health, or Peace." We shall now understand, that Salam is only another form of Salveo,—Salve Domine. The *m* or *v* is an organical addition to the *L*. The simple form is in Sal*us*, Sal*utation*, &c., all belonging to the Solum, meaning that which is Solid—*Firm*—or *Founded*. *Health—Hail—Whole*, &c. belong to *Salus*, &c., when the sound of *s* is weak.

The Greek Is*os*, (Ισος, Æqualis, Par,) and the Latin *Æquus*, might be referred to the Celtic Is, &c., Below; though there is some difficulty in the case. They might have signified in their original sense, To Level with the *Ground*, as we express it; and hence *Level* in general. In the compound Iso-*Pedon*, (Ισοπεδον, Planities,) from Is*os*, (Ισος,) and *Pedon*, (Πεδον,) the Ground, the word is brought to its original Spot. It is applied often, as it should seem on this hypothesis, with great propriety to a Balance, where the weights tend to the *Ground;* and in the compounds Iso*elkes* or Iso*klines*, Is*orropeo*, (Ισοελκης, par pondere, Ισοκλινης, Æqualiter vergens, de Æquilibrio, Ισορροπεω, Æquilibrium facio,) from Is*os* and *Elko—Klino*, *Repo*, (Ελκω, Traho, Κλινω, Vergo, Ρεπω, Vergo,) Tending equally *Downwards*; the term still retains, as we might suppose, its original peculiarity of meaning. But in the Latin *Æquus*, and its derivatives, the force of this meaning appears

appears more striking. *Æquo* signifies "To *Equal*, or lay flat "or *Level*," which is the first sense, produced by Robert Ainsworth; and the example under it is "Excisamque ÆQUAVIT "*Solo*," where we are at once brought to the Spot, supposed in my Hypothesis. But the sense of ÆQUOR, "*Any plain, or level* "*superficies;* and by a Synec. (1.) the EARTH. (2.) the Sea," as given by this writer, exhibits the precise meaning, which my Hypothesis has unfolded. Hence, we know, proceed ÆQUAL*is*, ÆQUAL, and the terms in modern Languages, *Egal*, (Fr.) &c. The *Al* in *Æqualis* might arise from the construction of the Language, unless we imagine, that the word is the same compound as *Isel*, &c. The Greek EESS*aomai*, EESS*on*, (Ησσαομαι, Inferior Discedo, Superor, vincor, succumbo, proprie et tropice, Ησσων, Minor, Inferior,) are derived from the idea of the *Low* Situation. The Substantive EESSA or EETTA is directly interpreted by the *Lower Parts*. Ησσα, vel Ηττα, Adversum Prælium, Clades, *Inferiores Partes*. In the same column of my Greek Vocabulary, where these words are, I find EESO, *(Eras,)* EESTO—EETO, from Ημαι, Sedeo; where we have a similar notion of the *Base* or *Foundation*, on which any thing is *Situated*—Placed or Is. I find likewise EESUK*os*, (Ησυχος, Tranquillus, Otiosus,) which we must refer to the idea of that, which is *Laid down*, as in a certain *Fixed Spot* or *Place*, at *Rest*. *Sedeo* comprehends these different ideas; as it means "To *Sit*—To *Sit still*, to *loiter, to be idle*.—"To be Situate in a *Low* Place." Thus we see, how EESUK*os*, (Ησυχος, Otiosus,) Idle, belongs to EESSA, EETTA, (Ησσα, Ηττα, Inferiores partes,) the *Low* place.—*Sedate*—*Sedatus, Sedo*, "To "stint, quiet; pacify, calm or still," belong to the same metaphor of the *Sedes*—the *Seat*—the Fixed or certain *Place* or *Spot*.—In the Greek ESK*atos*, and UST*eros*, UST*atos*, (Εσχατος, Ultimus, Postremus;—Summus, Υστερος, Posterior, Υστατος, Ultimus,) the ESK and the UST have the same meaning of the *Low Situation*.

In

In examining the word Eskatos, (Εσχατος,) I cast my eyes on Estia, (Εστια, Focus, Lar;—Domus;—Vesta, Dea,) the *Hearth*, where we unequivocally see the idea of the Place, upon the *Ground* or Earth, and *Eskara*, (Εσχαρα, Focus et Craticula in foco;—Basis, &c.—Crusta ex adustione vulneri adhærens,) where we have a similar idea. The Esk in Eskara, (Εσχαρα,) has the same sense, I believe, as in Eskatos, (Εσχατος); but I cannot decide, whether the *Kar* in *Eskara*, or *Esk-Kara*, be significant or not. It may belong to the Element KR, denoting the *Ground* or Surface, to *Scar*, &c. &c. It is even possible, that the *Esk* may not be significant in this word, but that the *E* may be only a prefix. Yet my first conjecture is, I think, right. The term *Uster-os*, (Υστερος,) is open to the same difficulty; and to these we may add *Askaris*, (Ασχαρις, Genus Lumbricorum,) *Asirakos*, (Ασιρακος, Locustæ genus, carens pinnis,) *Askaros*, *Askera*, (Ασκαρος, Calceorum, seu Sandaliorum genus, Ασκερα, Calceamenti Attici genus, &c.) terms which appear to be derived from the *Ground*, as the names of Animals crawling on the *Ground*, and of Shoes, striking against the *Ground*.

Terms derived from the idea of that, which is *Placed*—*Settled*—that which *Rests* or *Reposes* in the same spot:—Hence, *Rest*—*Repose*—*Quiet*, &c.

Otium—Ease, Eath, Aise—Agio, Adagio, (Lat. Eng. Fr. Ital.) Rest, the act of Reposing, or being *Settled* in a certain Spot. Being in a *Settled* state.

Eudo. (Greek,) To Sleep—To Rest—Repose.

As-Aish. (Pers.) *Ease*, Rest, Repose.

Asaish *Dashten*. (Pers.) To enjoy Tranquillity—To Abide, Dwell, Stop, Stand still.

Ees-Uchia. (Gr.) Quiet, Tranquillity.

Eeka. (Gr.) Quietly, &c.

I SHALL produce in this place the terms, which denote *Rest—Repose—Quiet*, &c.; and which I conceive to be derived from the idea of that, which is *Placed—Settled—Rests* or *Reposes* on the same *Base* or *Foundation*. Let us first note the Latin term OTium, a derivative of which we have seen adopted in the explanation of EESUCHOS, (Ησυχος, *Otiosus*.) R. Ainsworth explains OTium by "Leisure, Rest, spare time, freedom from business;—"Idleness, a doing nothing;—the living at *Ease* and in Security," which I imagine to be originally derived from the idea of that, which is *Laid down—Seated*—or *Settled* on the same Place, or on the same *Base* or *Foundation*, in a state of *Rest* or *Repose*. I have shewn, that the adjacent words Os, *Oris*, "the Mouth, Pas-"sage, or Enterance into any place;—the Head, Fountain," and Os, Ossis, the Bone, opposite as they may seem in sense, are derived from the same idea of the *Base*, either as signifying the Extreme Surface, or as denoting what is *Strong—Firm*, &c. The term OTium and its derivatives are used, in their genuine turn of meaning, in such phrases as the following in Terence: "*Otiose* nunc "jam illico hic *Consiste*, Abide at *Rest* or *Repose*, here." R. Ainsworth produces this phrase under *Consisto*, which he explains by "To Abide, stay, tarry, or keep, in one *Place*." Let us mark the explanatory term *Repose*, which is taken likewise from a similar idea of *Placing* or Fixing in a certain Spot.—The Etymologists derive this word from Οθω, Moveo, *Ocius*, &c. per antiphrasin—from *Utor*—Οκνος, &c. &c. Perhaps OKnos, (Οκνος, Pigritia, Ignavia, Segnities,) belongs to a similar notion. In the phrase OTIOSUS *Ager*, a *Lay'd down* Field, as we express it, we are brought to the original spot, from which I suppose this term to be derived. EASE, and its parallel terms, AISE, (Fr.) *Agie*, *Adagio*, (Ital.) belong to OTium, as some have understood; though others derive it from EDus, (Ηδυς, Suavis, Dulcis.) EASY belongs to *Ease*, though some refer it to *Aisa*, (Αισα, Fatum,) Fate, Destiny.

Junius has the term EATH, signifying the same as *Easy*, Facilis, which he derives from *Ethos* (Εθος,) Mos. In Saxon, EATH is Facilis, from whence is taken *Un-Eath*, (Sax.) as Skinner justly observes, who refers the word in Chaucer, *Unneth*, Vix, to this term. *Ease* occurs in the same column of Skinner's Dictionary with *Earth*, which will more strongly suggest to us, that EASE and EATH belong to the idea of being EARTHed, or of being Placed — Fixed, &c., or of *Resting* — *Reposing* — Remaining on a certain Spot of EARTH.—It is curious, that Shakspeare uses EASE, as connected with a term, which most strongly expresses the idea of being *Fixed* in a certain Spot—or EARTH:

> " And duller should'st thou be than the fat weed,
> " That *Roots itself in* EASE on Lethe wharf,
> " Would'st thou not stir in this." (*Ham.* A. I. S. 5.)

In the Poems, attributed to Rowley, *Ethie* is applied to Lying down, or Reposing on a Bed:

> " As when a bordelier onn ETHIE bedde,
> " Tyr'd with the laboures maynt of sweltrie daie,
> " Yn slepeis bosom laieth hys deft headde."
> (*The Storie of W. Canynge*, v. 85. &c.)

We shall now understand, that the Greek EUDO, (Ευδω, Dormio,) signifies, To *Rest* or *Repose;* and shall perceive, how it is connected with *Edos*, (Εδος, Sedes,) &c.—AISE in French signifies " Une *Region.*" I shew in another place, that *Asia*, the quarter of the Globe, means simply the *Land* or *Country*. In barbarous Latin, *Asiatim* occurs in a passage, where prayers are ordered to be read " Non cursim, ac festinanter, sed *Asiatim*, et tractim;" which Menage has explained by *Posement* in French, and ADAGIO in Italian, the corresponding word to *Agio*, *Aise*, &c. Let us mark the word *Posement*, which contains precisely the same metaphor, and belongs, we know, to *Poser*, " To lay, *Set*, *Put*, *Place*,—to Rest," &c.

There

There is a Persian term, which will perfectly explain the meaning annexed to EASE, OT*ium*, &c. In Persian اسایش ASAISH signifies "Tranquillity, EASE, quiet, *Rest*, peace, *Repose*, Leisure," as Mr. Richardson explains it; and ASAISH *Dashten* اسایش داشتن "1. To Enjoy tranquillity, &c. 2. To *Abide*, *Dwell*, *Stop*, *Stay*, "*Stand still*," where we see the original idea annexed to these words. In the same column of Mr. Richardson's Dictionary we have As*ayaniden*, "To give *Rest*, pacify;" As*ayiden*, "To Rest, to "cease;" and "اساي Asai (for اسا)" *Asa*, "1. Like, resembling. "2. Ease, quiet." The Persian اسا *Asa* signifies "Pacifying, "soothing;" and "Like, Resembling." Though they are placed by Mr. Richardson in different articles, they belong probably to each other. Why the idea of *Likeness* is connected with that of EASE, I must leave the Persian Scholars to unravel, from the peculiar turn of meaning annexed to the word. We have seen, that the Greek Is*os*, (Ισος, Similis,) is connected with the Ground, from the idea of Laying things *Level* with the Ground; and hence *Level* or *Like* in general. The Persian *Asa* اسا is adjacent to the Arabic اس As or Uss, "A Foundation, Basis." The Persian *Asaish* is a repetition of the same word AS-AS, AS-AISH, in order to convey more strongly the idea. In the same opening of Mr. Richardson's Dictionary we have the Arabic اساس As-As, "A Foundation, Basis," where the same reduplication takes place. The succeeding term to As*ayiden*, To Rest, is the Persian, اساب ASAB, A Horse, which belongs to the Arabic word next following it, اسب ISB, the Fundament, as derived from the idea of the animal, on which a person is *Seated* or Rides. The Arabic اساب ASAB, Fundaments, is another form of ISB, and they belong to the Hebrew שם' ISM, To Place, שב' ISB, To Sit. Again, in Persian, اسودن As*uden* is "To Rest, &c. To quiet, pacify, si-"lence;" and the preceding term to this is اسودگي AS-UDGI, "Quiet, rest, peace, repose, tranquillity," where we have probably another

another compound, as in As-Aish. Lye produces, under the English Ease, the Gothic Azets, Facilis, the Irish *Easgaidh*, and the Armoric *Æs*. The Gothic *Azetizo*, Facilius, succeeds, in Lye's Dictionary, another Gothic word, Azjo, Cinis, Ashes, where we are brought to the Earth, probably under the idea of *Dirt*. Lhuyd, under *Facilis*, produces the Welsh *Hawdd*, "Easy to be "done, very feasible." I must leave the Celtic Scholars to decide, whether the Celtic words produced above belong to the train of ideas, which I am now unfolding. In the same opening of Mr. Richards' Dictionary, where this Welsh word is found, I see Hedd, Peace, and *Heddwch*, "Peace, quietness, tranquillity." To this latter term he has referred the Greek *Esychia*, (Ησυχια, Quies.) This word must be added to the terms now under discussion, as I have before suggested. The Greek *Eesuchos* (Ησυχος, Tranquillus, Otiosus,) is used in its genuine sense, when it is applied in such phrases as these, Ησυχοι Θασσσ' επ' ακταις, &c. *Otiosi* Sedent ad littora, &c. (Euripid. Hecub. 35. 6.) where we see the idea of being *Stationary* in a certain Spot. *Sedatus*, (Lat.) "Appeased, "Quieted; Smooth, Still; Sober, *Sedate*, and *Sedatè*, (Lat.) "Quietly, Stilly, Calmly, Patiently," as they are explained by R. Ainsworth, have a similar meaning, and belong, we know, to *Sedes*. I shall shew in a future Volume, that *Placidus*, *Placid*, is derived from *Place* for the same reason, and that it is brought in contact with the original idea in such phrases as *Sedibus Placidis*. Perhaps the ES-YC*h* in these words is the same compound, as in the Persian AS-AISH and AS-UDGI. The Greek Eeka, (Ηκα, Leniter, quiete, sensim, submisse,) must be referred to a similar idea.

EETHOS. (Greek.) The Fixed Place or Spot of Ground for Dwelling — Appropriate and Peculiar to each person: And hence, what is *Appropriate* or *Peculiar* to each person, as certain Habits of Life, manners, &c.

ETHOS. (Greek.) Manners—Customs, Peculiar to certain Persons.

EETHO. (Gr.) To Strain, Sift; that is, To Separate things according to their *Peculiar Sort—Quality—Property*—To *Sort*.

IN the same column of my Greek Vocabulary, where Hκα occurs, I find EETHOS, (Hθος, Domicilium, mansio, sedes consuetæ,) where we have directly the *Fixed, Established Spot or Place—Appropriate* or *Peculiar* to each person, as in EDOS, (Εδος, Sedes, &c.) EETHOS, (Hθος, Ingenium, indoles, morum quædam proprietas,) likewise denotes the Fixed—*Settled* Manners or Habits, *Appropriate* to each person, derived from the Fixed—*Appropriate* Spot. The ordinary Vocabularies consider these words as separate Roots. The Greek ETHOS, (Εθος, Ritus, Mos, Consuetudo,) belongs to EETHOS, Hθος, Sedes Consuetæ, et Mores Consueti, or, as it might be explained, Quod unicuique *Stabile* vel *Proprium* manet, sive sit Domus, seu mos. The German *Sitte* has a similar meaning of "Custom, Fashion, *Mode*, &c.—*Sitten*-lehre, the *Ethics*, or Mo-"rals, &c." as my Lexicographer explains it, with a similar relation to *Sitz*, and *Sitzen*, corresponding with our words *Seat*, and *Sit*. My Lexicographer explains *Sittsam*, among other things, by "Well-mannered,—*Stayed, Sedate*,—of good Morals,—*Composed*." The form of *Ethos*, (Εθος,) will perhaps seem more directly to connect itself with EDOS, (Εδος, Sedes, &c.) The succeeding word to *Ethos*, (Εθος,) in my Greek Vocabulary, is *Ethou*, which is said to be put for ETHESO,

ETHeso, from *Tithemi* to *Place*, (Εθε, pro Εθεσο, à Τιθημι,) where we see the true notion, and the original form, not derived from construction. In *Theo*, (Θεω, Pono,) To Place, the vowel breathing before the *T* has been lost, or the word was formed by the Greeks in order to agree with the analogy of *Theso*, (Θησω.) An adjacent word to *Ethos*, (Εθος,) is ETHNOS, (Εθνος, Gens, Natio,) which coincides with EDEN, ADEN, (Heb. and Arab.) the *Permanent Dwelling*, as I have before shewn. An adjacent word in my Greek Vocabulary to *Eethos*, (Ηθος,) is EETHO, (Ηθω, Colo,) To Strain, which may perhaps belong to *Eethos*, (Ηθος, Proprius Locus, et Propria Qualitas,) the *Proper* or *Peculiar* Spot or Quality, under the idea of *Separating things* into their due *Proper* Places, according to their *Peculiar Properties*—Qualities, or Sorts. In short, EETHO (Ηθω,) signifies To *Place*—To *Appropriate*, or To *Proper*, (if I may so express it,) whether it relates to Separation by Placing things in their *Proper* Spot, or by arranging things according to their *Proper* Quality.—If *Eetho*, (Ηθω,) relates more immediately to *Eethos*, (Ηθος, Natura,) under the sense of *Sort* or Quality; then it would signify, as we express it, *To Sort*. Let us mark *Colo*, *Colare*, which belongs to *Colo*, *Colere*, and to *Solum*, under the idea of Tilling, or Meliorating, Dressing, Cleansing, &c. The AITA in the Greek *di*-AITA, (Διαιτα, Vitæ seu vivendi institutum, Vitæ ratio, Vitæ genus;—Habitatio, Domicilium, Cubiculum,) the *Certain* Spot for Habitation, and the Certain Mode of Life, seems to belong to EETHOS, (Ηθος.) From *Diaita*, (Διαιτα,) the term in Modern Languages, *Diet*, is, we know, derived. If we suppose the verb Διαιταω to have been the original, the *Di* or *Dia* might belong to the preposition Δια.—Before I quit these terms, denoting certain Modes and *Habits* from the Fixed Appropriate Dwelling Spot, I must remind the Reader, that the very explanatory term *Habits* is derived from the same idea—from *Habito*, To Dwell.

Terms

Terms signifying To *Heal, Cure*, &c. derived from the idea of Making *Firm—Stout—Strong*, &c., or *Establishing* or *Setting* up, the *Health*—Constitution, &c., as on a *Firm Base* or *Foundation*.

As. (Arab.) A *Base*, or *Foundation*.

Asa. (Arab.) *Healing*,—Composing or *Settling* differences.

Iach-Ach. (Welsh,) A Stem, &c.

Iach. (W.) Healthful, Sound, Whole, &c.

Iachau. (W.) To Heal, Cure.

Ak-*eomai*. (Greek.) To Heal, Cure.

Ugies. (Gr.) Sound, Whole, Healthy.

ISH. (Heb.) To Save.

Jesus. The Saviour.

Icam-Ic. (Gal.) To Heal, Cure; A Cure, &c.

Iklus. (Gal.) Healing.

Ukelos. (Gr.) Whole.

Asil. (Arab.) Foundation, Firm, Permanent.

Osaquille. (Biscany.) A Physician.

Æscul-*Apius*.

Ascl-*Epius*.

We shall find certain terms, belonging to the Element ^C, ^D, &c. which signify To *Heal, Cure*, &c., and which are derived, as I imagine, from the notion of the *Base*—or *Foundation*. These ideas may appear on the first view to be remote and dissimilar; yet we shall soon acknowledge that they are intimately blended with each other. — To *Heal*, or To *Cure*, &c. is, To make *Firm*—*Stout* and *Strong*—To *Establish* the Health, or to *Set up* the Constitution, according to our expression, as on a *Firm Base* or *Foundation*. We have seen the Arabic اس As signifying "A Foundation, "Basis;" and in the same column of Mr. Richardson's Dictionary we have اسا Asa, "Curing, Healing.—Composing differences, "making peace.—Leaving Remains of meat." These words belong

belong to each other. We here see, that the sense of *Healing* and *Composing differences* is derived from the idea of *Settling* or *Establishing*, as on a Base or Foundation, what is weak or unstable. The sense of *Remains* of Meat belongs to the same idea of a *Base*, on which things *Remain*—Last—Continue, &c. Now precisely the same union of the *Base*, and the sense of *Healing*, occurs in the dialects of the Celtic. Ach in Welsh means "A Stem or "Pedigree; the Lineage of one's ancestors." This word is used in its due sense, when it means the *Stem*, that is, the *Base* and *Foundation*, from which things or persons spring. Iach in the same Language is used "commonly for Ach," says Mr. Richards; and in the article of that writer's Dictionary succeeding this term, we have "Iach, Healthful, sound, whole, wholesome, in health. "So in Arm. Also not damaged, corrupted or spoiled." Iachau is the succeeding term, which Mr. Richards explains by "To Heal, "Cure, or Remedy." To these words he refers the Greek Ugies, (Υγιης, Sanus,) and Akeomai, and *Iaomai*, (Ακεομαι, Ιαομαι, Sano.) We shall at once agree, that Ugies, and Akeomai, (Υγιης, Ακεομαι,) belong to Iachau; and yet on this latter Greek word some difficulty might be raised. The Greek Akeomai, (Ακεομαι, Sano, medeor, medicor, —metaph. Expio, sarcio, resarcio, &c.) means, To Heal, and To Repair or Mend torn garments, &c. Ακεισθαι τα διερρωγοτα, ὑποδηματα. Now *Akestra*, (Ακεστρα, Acus,) means a Needle, which may belong to Ake, (Ακη, Acies ferri,) the sharp-pointed instrument—the Acus. I shall shew in another place that Ake (Ακη) and Acuo, &c. belong to the idea of Stirring up the *Surface* of the Earth,—Occandi Terram. Here another difficulty might be suggested. I have supposed, that Ord, (Sax.) Ardis (Αρδις, Cuspis teli,) denote the Point of any Instrument, from the simple idea of the *Base*—*Surface* or *Top*, without any notion of *Stirring up* that Surface; and Ake, (Ακη,) might be derived from a similar idea. In such a case, the Edge of an Instrument, and the

Edge

EDGE of the Water, the Extreme part, would agree in their original idea. Still however I imagine, that AKE, (Ακη,) and Acuo, &c. belong to Occo, &c.; yet I should not omit observing, that AKE, (Ακη,) as it appears in the ordinary Vocabulary of Hederic, is interpreted in one sense by *Quies*, where we have only the idea of the *Base*, or *Surface*, and the Stability annexed to it, and not that of the *Surface*, as combined with the notion of agitation.—Whatever we may think of AKeomai, (Ακεομαι,) we shall be satisfied, that IACHau, and UGies, (Υγιης,) belong to the metaphor of *Settling*, as on a due *Base* or *Foundation*, what is *Unstable — Weak*, &c. &c.—In our phrase, "To *Set up* a person," as applied to Health, we have a similar metaphor. The Welsh ASSIO, "To Solder "or Sodder, to join, fasten, or glue together," and IASSU, bearing the same meaning, must be referred to IACHU, To Heal.

The Welsh Lexicographers refer IACHAU to the Hebrew ישע ISH, or ISG, which signifies To "*Preserve* or Deliver." Whether they should be referred to each other, I cannot decide. Mr. Parkhurst refers to the Hebrew word the Greek *Soo*, *Sozo*, *Soter*, (Σοω, Σωζω, Salvo, Servo, Σωτηρ, Salvator,) which appear to belong to the Element ST. From this Hebrew term is acknowledged to be derived the name JESUS, IEES-*ous*, (Ιησους,) &c. &c. the *Saviour* or Deliverer, and hence we have JOSHUA, &c. The Hebrew ישע ISH should probably however be referred to the race of words now under discussion. The preceding term in Mr. Parkhurst's Lexicon, ישן ISN, "To sleep, to be in a sound sleep," certainly belongs to אן the Pillar, EDEN, עדן the Place of Settlement, &c. The original idea of the word is that of *Being Laid* down or *Settled* in a certain fixed Place, Spot or Situation. Mr. Parkhurst explains it in one sense by "*Laid* up in store, *Laid* by or asleep, "in a quiet, undisturbed state;" and Taylor says, that it is applied to things, which "have *Continued* long in the same *State* "or *Situation*, unaltered, unmeddled with, unmolested." The

preceding word to this, in Mr. Parkhurst's Lexicon, is ישם ISM, which signifies "To Place, Set, Put," where IS in IS-*SM* belongs to the race of words before us. The preceding term to this is ישט IST, "To Extend, Stretch out, as a sceptre," says Mr. Parkhurst, which means only 'To Place or *Put* out.' The term before this is ישה ISH, which denotes "Is, are, Was, Were," or, Is —Are *Placed—Situated*, &c.

We have seen, that the Greek *Iaomai*, (Ιαομαι, Sano,) has been compared with the Welsh IACHAU; and if it belongs to this Celtic term, the radical form is to be seen in IAS*omai*, (Ιασομαι, fut.) In Mr. Shaw's Galic and Irish Dictionary we have Ic*am*, "To "Heal, Cure, Supply, Eek," and Ic, "A Cure, remedy, supply, "Eek." An adjacent word is ICL*us*, "Healing by Herbs." This seems to be a compound of Ic and *CL*, corresponding with ASIL, Firm, Established. In the Language of Biscany, OSAGUILLE, is a Physician which belongs to IKLUS. Hervas, in his work on Languages, has the following remark: "Medico dicesi OSAGUILLE "da *Osatu*, Sanare, e da *Guille* verbale di *Eguin*, fare: onde "OSAGUILLE colui, che fa sanare." (Catalogo delle Lingue by Hervas, p. 204.) Hence is derived our name ASGILL; and hence the ÆSCUL in the name of ÆSCUL-*Apius*. The *Apius* in this word seems to be the same as *Iapis* in Virgil, which is a name, as I imagine, derived from his Art. In ASCL-*Epius* we have another form of this word. In Greek, UKEL*os*, (Υκελος, Sanus,) agrees with the form IKL*us*, ASIL.—We must, I think, own, that *Apius* and *Iapis* belong to each other; though I cannot satisfy myself respecting the source, from which they are derived. In Arabic, اسا ASA is "A Physician, a Surgeon," where we have the simpler form; and the same word signifies "A pillar, column," where we are brought to the original idea of that which makes *Firm—Establishes*, &c. as on a Sound Base. In the same page of Mr. Richardson's Dictionary we have the Arabic اسية *Asiyet*, "A "Female

" Female Physician or Surgeon, &c.—A Column, large pillar, " prop, support, the main beam of a House," &c.—Asis, اسيس Foundations, اسو Asu, " Curing, Healing.—Composing dif- " ferences.—Leaving Remains (at dinner, &c.)," another form of Asa, اسا produced above; and the Persian اسودن *Asuden*, " To rest, &c.—To quiet, pacify, silence;" which is derived from the idea of making any thing to *Rest*, or to remain Fixed, as on a *Base* or *Foundation*, as I have before observed.

Words denoting *Time* or *Duration*, derived from the idea of that which IS, or *Endures;* or of that which is *Set—Established*, &c., as on a *Base* or *Foundation;* so as to *Last—Continue—Endure*, &c.

As. (Arab.) The Foundation, Basis: Earliest age, Eternity.

Age. (Eng.) What Lasts, Remains, Endures.

Aei, quasi Aej. (Gr.) Always, for

Ay. (Eng.) Ever.

Aye—Yes. (Eng.) It Is.

Ætas, Æternus. (Lat.)

Oed. (Welsh,) Time, a *Set* Time to come.

Oedd. (Welsh,) Was.

Oes. (Welsh,) An *Age;* There *Is.*

Oestad. (Welsh,) Constant.

Eadh. (Gal.) Time, Yea, *Yes.*

Yog, (Sanscrit,) An *Age.*

Oed, Oat, Uz, Aos, Aois, Aidhne, Ette. (Celt.) Ætas.

Is, Is-Is. (Heb.) What *Is*, Old, Ancient,

Og-Ug-*ios*. (Gr.) Old.

Ad-Ag-*ium*. (Lat.) The *Old* Saying.

Eca. (Sax.) Æternus.

Et*os*. (Gr.) A Year.

Et*os*—Et*eos*. (Gr.) True—what is Well Founded.

Etumos, or Et-*tumos*. (Greek,) True.

Etymology.

I shall

I SHALL produce in this article, terms belonging to our Element ^C, ^D, ^G, &c., which relate to *Time*, and which, as I conceive, are derived from the idea of the *Base* or *Foundation*, or of *Settling*—*Establishing* on or in a certain *Place*—*Situation*—*Position*—*State*, &c. Here again these notions appear very remote from each other; but we shall readily understand, how intimately they are blended in the same train of ideas. In whatever point of view we consider the subject, we shall be brought to the same point. What is *Fixed* or *Established*, as on a *Base* or *Foundation*, is best calculated To *Remain*—*Last* or *Endure;* and from the idea of that which *Lasts* or *Endures*, we are brought directly to the notion of *Time*.—We know, that the very term *Duration*, which is applied to *Time*, belongs to a similar metaphor of that, which *Lasts*—or *Continues*, &c., as things, which are *Firm*—*Solid*, &c. This very union of ideas, which I have conceived to exist between the *Base* and *Time*, is to be found, as we have seen, in an Arabic word, which I have thought it necessary to produce on various occasions. In this Language, the word اس As or Uss signifies in its first sense, as Mr. Richardson explains it, " A Foundation, " Basis." In other senses it denotes " The Heart of Man (as " being the Foundation of Life.) The Beginning of any thing.— " The Earliest Age, Eternity.—The Cinders or Ashes Remaining." In the sense of the " *Earliest Age, Eternity,*" we see the idea of *Time* or *Duration*,—Past as well as Future,—derived from the primary sense of the *Base* or *Foundation*.

The words adopted in Mr. Richardson's explanation, AGE and ET*ernus*, must be referred to the same idea as Uss اس in Arabic. The Etymologists, under AGE, refer us to the French *Age*, the Saxon *A*, *Æwa*, the Runic and Danish *Æ*, Semper, Æternum, the Greek *Aei*, (Αει); and they record, moreover, the English *Ay*. Where we see the vowel Breathing only, we must conclude that the Radical Consonant has been lost; though it may not be easy to

to decide, what that Consonant might have been; but in the Greek *Aei*, and the English *Ay*, or *Aye*, the *I* and *Υ* remain as the record of the lost consonant *Ϳ*, quasi AEJ, AJE. The Etymologists refer us, under *Ay*, Semper, to the Gothic *Aiw*, the Saxon *A*, *Awa*, the Danish *Æ*, the Belgic *Ewe*, *Euwe*, &c., and the Greek *Aion*, (Αιων, Ævum, Æternitas, Seculum,) which is quasi A*jon*. We shall find, that the Element ^N denotes Time; but it seems that *Aion*, (Αιών,) is a compound of *Aei*, and *On*, (Ων,) 'Being for *Ay*.' There is a difficulty respecting some of the words, where the vowel Breathing only remains, as *Æwa*, &c., in deciding whether the Consonant *Ϳ* or *V* is lost; since the Element ^V denotes Time, as in the Latin *Ævum*. But in *Ay* or *Aye* the matter is evident, as the *Υ* remains to record the lost *Ϳ*. We shall now understand, that *Ay*, the term of Assent, and *Ay*, denoting Time, belong to a similar idea. AY, the term of Assent, quasi AJ, conveys the same idea as EST or IS, It IS—or It IS so and so—It IS true: and AY or AYE, denoting Time, quasi AJ, means likewise IS—It IS—It *Remains*—*Endures*—*Lasts*—*Continues*, &c. In the English *Yea*, "Sic, certe, sane, "Ita Est," and the corresponding terms, *Gea*, (Sax.) *Ga*, *Gai*, (Goth.) *Ja*, (Germ. and Swed.) *Ie*, *Ya*, (Wel. Arm.) the vowel breathing succeeds the Consonant of the Radical G, J; but in YES, we have the true form Is, EST, &c. The Latin AIO, or, as it should be, AJO, contains the same idea as the English *Aye* or YES; quasi 'I AYE a thing—I YES—Is, (Eng.) EST, (Lat.) 'a thing,' if I may so express it;—'I assert a thing Is so and so.' The Etymologists have seen this idea, and have accordingly justly referred the word to the Hebrew היה HIA, or HAJAH, "Fuit, EST, "Erit." In the explanatory phrase *Ita est*, we have terms belonging to the same race. ITA, So, is nothing but EST—Is, It Is—so and so; or if ITA be not considered as the verb EST, it belongs to the same idea, to IT—ID, &c. *This*—*That*—mode or manner.

manner. Est is the verb of *Position* or *Being*, expressing the Position of the Thing—the Id—It, the *Placed*, or of the Is—the *Being*, *Existing*, and Ita the Position or State of the Thing or Being, so placed and Existing. Id, That thing—the *Placed*, Est, Is *(Placed)*, Ita, Thus, in such a *Place* or *Position; Positum Ponitur* in *Positione*—hâc vel illâ, &c.

I have before observed, that the term *Existence*, which is derived, we know, from *Sisto*, belongs to the same metaphor of *Place* or Position; and the Id Est Ita I conceive to be precisely the same, as that, which we might perhaps be permitted to express by '*Existens Existit* in *Existentia.*' This mode of considering the relation between such terms as Est—Id and Ita, will sufficiently convey to the Reader my conception respecting the nature of their formation.—We shall find, that the race of words denoting *Time* is connected with such terms, as Est—Id, &c. &c., as denoting *Existence*—*Situation*—*State*, under the idea of *Continuance*—or *Duration* in that *State;* and I shall not stop to enquire, whether such terms denoting *Duration* belong to the first idea of *Existence*, as in Est, or to its secondary *Demonstrative* idea, expressed by Id.—In short, we shall agree, that words denoting *Time* would be naturally connected with words denoting *Existence;* since we cannot so properly express all the three divisions of Time—Present, Past, and To Come, as by the verb of *Existence*, as the 'Tempus, quod Est—Erit aut Fuit.' We all moreover agree, that the idea of *Existence* from *Sisto* is directly connected with that of *Settling—Situating—Placing*, as on a *Base* or *Foundation;* and thus we see, how words denoting *Time* may be derived from this source. I must again repeat, that I shall not stop to adjust on every occasion the links of the chain, by which such words are connected with the original notion.

The Latin *Æternus* is derived from *Ætas*, and *Ætas* is supposed to be quasi *Ævitas* from *Ævum*, though some derive it

it from Etos, (Ετος, Annus,) a term belonging to the same race. In *Æternus, Eternal*, we see the genuine idea of a *Long-Continued* Time. R. Ainsworth explains it by "(1.) *Eternal.* (2.) *Continual*, "Perpetual, (3.) *Lasting*, of *Long Continuance*, During life;" and ÆTAS is applied in its primitive turn of meaning, when it denotes "*A Long indefinite Space of Time*," as R. Ainsworth explains it in one of its senses. In Welsh, OES is "An Age, or "the whole time of a man's life;" and OED, "Time, an appointed "time to come, a set day to come. A delaying or putting off, "a delaying of the Time;" where we see likewise the idea of a Long Continuance, or of Duration. In the same Language, OES means "There Is, or Is there?" where we have the very idea, with which I suppose the sense of *Time* to be connected. The succeeding word to OES, There Is, in Mr. Richards' Dictionary, is OES*tad*, "Constant, Constantly, Always;" where we might doubt to what word it should be immediately referred, whether to OES, Time, or OES, There Is;—What Is—*Remains*—*Endures*, &c., from which likewise we see the union of these ideas. OEDD means in Welsh, "He (she or it) Was." Mr. Richards has another article for OED, Age; and we find likewise OEDRAN, "Aged, stricken in years," where we have the same form as in ÆTERN-*us*. I have supposed, that these terms for *Time* belong to the Element ^C, ^D, &c., under the same metaphor, which we see in *Existo* from *Sisto*. Let us mark the explanation to OED, "A *Set* Day to come," where in *Set* we have a term belonging to *Sisto;* and let us note, moreover, the explanation of Æternus by *Continual*. R. Ainsworth interprets *Sisto*, in the first sense, by "To *Set*," &c., and in the second, by "To "*Continue*." These coincidences are worthy of our notice, if we need any additional proofs for the confirmation of my hypothesis. In the Galic, AOIS is "Age—EATA, Old, Ancient—"EADH, Time, Opportunity, Season." This latter word EADH, which

which Mr. Shaw has placed in a separate article, likewise means "Yea, Yes;" where we have the same union of ideas, and from the same cause, as in AYE, the term denoting *Time*, and Assent to a proposition.—To AGE, &c. belongs the Sanscrit YUG, the period of time, the AGE, &c. In Welsh, HAWG is "A good "while;" and the preceding term to it in Mr. Richards' Dictionary is HAWES, "A She *Ass*." I have shewn, that Ass belongs to the idea conveyed by the *Base* or *Foundation*, as denoting the patient animal, which *Supports* — *Sustains* — *Bears* or *Carries*. In *Lhuyd*, the Celtic terms for *Ætas* are, "*Oed*, *Oat*, *Uz*, *Aos*, *Aois*, "*Aidhne*, *Ette*."

The Hebrew ישׁה ISH, יש IS, unequivocally shews us, how the sense of *Time* or *Duration* is derived from the idea of what IS—what *Endures*, or what IS—so *Placed*, *Situated*, &c., as to be *During*—*Lasting*, *Continuing*. This term יש IS not only signifies "IS, Are, Was, Were—*Subsistence*, *Permanency*," &c.; but it means likewise, when doubled, as ישׁישׁ or יישׁ ISS, IS-IS, "Very "old or ancient, very far advanced in years, one who has been, "or lived a great while." Mr. Parkhurst justly refers to this Hebrew word, Is, YES; and he imagines too, that ICE is a derivative. Whether ICE belongs to this race of words, under the idea of what is of a *Solid Consistency*, as we express it, I cannot decide. Let us here mark the term *Consistency*, which we know may refer to the Solidity of ICE, and which belongs, as we know likewise, to the metaphor of *Establishing*—*Fixing*, &c.—*Sistendi*. It is curious, that we find this very metaphor and word applied to the formation of this very substance ICE, as we all remember, in Horace: "Geluque Flumina *Constiterint* acuto." Let us mark, moreover, in Mr. Parkhurst's explanation, the term *Subsistence*, where we have the same metaphor from *Sisto*—such as I conceive to be attached to the Hebrew word itself. In Hebrew, עת OT signifies "Time, season, opportunity," which still

still belongs to the idea of what Is or *Exists*, but not under the sense of *Continuation*, as that which Is—*Lasting* or *Enduring;* but as that, which Is now present—which now *Exists*, or, as we might precisely express it by a kindred word drawn from the same metaphor, Tempus, quod jam *Instat*—the *Instant* Time—This very *Instant*. Mr. Parkhurst explains it in one sense by "*At* "*This time, now;*" and he refers to it *Ætas* and *Otium*. It is idle to enquire in this case, whether OT belongs to the secondary sense *This* or *That*—Hoc—Id, &c., or Est, the difficulty of which I have before unfolded. We shall understand from the present discussions, in what manner these Latin words may be said to belong to the Hebrew term. The Hebrew עות Out, which is supposed to belong to עת OT, signifies "To incline, "cause to incline downwards, or more to one side than another," as Mr. Parkhurst explains it. I have supposed, that the sense of Time is derived from the idea of that, which Is—Placed, Laid, as on a *Base—Foundation;* and the sense of Inclining *downwards* brings us at once to the *Base*, or Low situation. From this idea of *Inclining* or *Declining downwards*, the word then passes into the sense of *Declining* in virtue—morals, &c. The form IS-IS of the Hebrew term will remind us of the Greek OG-UG to express the same idea in the word OG-UG-*ios*, (Ωγυγιος, *Ogygius;* Antiquus, Vetustus; Ab *Ogyge*, rege Antiquissimo.) In a former Work I have made the following observations on this word: "The "learned Editor of the Phœnissæ will now understand from "what source that confusion has arisen, which he finds in ancient "writers, respecting the Gates of Thebes. 'Maxima est in "Apollodoro difficultas, qui inter *Ogygias* portas et Oncaïdas "diserte distinguit. Oncaïdas et *Ogygias* easdem portas vocari "auctor est Hesychius. Ογκας Αθηνας· τας Ογυγιας πυλας λεγει.' "(Vide Porson. Phœniss. v. 1150.) The passage of Hesychius "is pregnant with difficulties; yet if he means to express (what

" this learned and accurate Critic appears to imagine,) that the " same gates were called *Onkai* and *Ogugiai*, which others have " supposed to be different, we shall find a ready solution of this " apparent contrariety. It will be instantly perceived, by repre- " senting these two words under their true forms, *Ogkai* or *Oggai*, " and *Ogugiai*, that one word has passed into the other by the " insertion of a vowel breathing between the consonants. Thus " a variation, the most minute in the original sound, became an " important difference, when represented by the symbol of letters." In an article of Hesychius, adjacent to that which I have just produced, I find *Ogugia*, signifying the *Limbs*, (Ογυγια, μελη.) We shall now understand, why *Ogugia* may relate to what is *Old*, and to the *Limbs*. The word *Substo*, and its derivative *Substantia*, have precisely the same metaphor. The Og-Ug-*ios*, (Ωγυγιος,) The Old Man, is the person, " qui *Substitit*," who has *Stood* it out, if I may so express it, who has Lasted or Endured; and the Og-Ug*ia* (Ογυγια, μελη,) The Limbs, are those things, " quæ " *Substare* possunt, quæ *Substantiam* habent," which are able to *Stand it* out, which are *Substantial*, so as to be able to Last—Endure, &c. We have seen, that Os, Oss*is*, the Bone, has been derived from a similar idea of *Firmness*—*Strength*, &c. Whether the Arabic عتيق At-Yk, " Old, Ancient, Antique, the Past," belongs to this race of words, I cannot decide.—The Latin Ad-Ag-*ium*, *o*, is precisely the same compound as in Og-Ug-*ios*, (Ωγυγιος,) and means the *Old* Saying. The Etymologists suppose, that *Adagio*, is so called, " quia ad *Agendum* apta sit," or that it is quasi *Abagio*, or " *Ambagio*. h. e. circumagio." In Saxon, Eca and Ece mean Æternus; and the two phrases produced under these words bring us to the original idea, from which they were taken, as Ecu, *Rest*,—Eca-*Setl*, Perpetuum solium; where the idea of *Rest* and the *Seat* coincides with the notion of what is *Situated* or *Settled* in a certain fixed Place or Spot. Before I quit

I quit the terms denoting *Old*, which belong to the form ^GG, I ought to observe, that they may possibly be attached to the Element ^NG, ^NK, ^N, &c.; since we find a race of words conveying the same idea, under that form, as *Antiquus*, *Ancient*, &c. &c. These words will be considered in another place, where it will be discussed, whether these forms originally belonged to each other.

The ETOS, (Ετος, Annus,) the name for a Year, is derived from the idea of that, which Is — *Lasting*, *Enduring*, &c.; which will be unequivocally manifest from a term under the same form, ETOS, or ETEOS, (Ετος, Verus, bonus, Ετεος, Verus,) True, which has the same meaning of what Is—*Firm*—*Stable*—well *Founded*. It is curious, that the writers of our School Vocabularies should acknowledge this radical idea in the term ETOS, (Ετος, Verus,) True; who derive it from Ειμι, Sum. A word under the same form, ETOS, (Ετος, Frustra, temere, perfunctorie,) and its derivative *Etosios*, (Ετωσιος, Inanis, cassus, inutilis,) 'Vain, Futile, Idle,' seem to contain ideas, very remote from those, which I have now unfolded; but a little consideration will unravel this difficulty. I have before produced a race of words, which denote *Inactivity*, and which are derived from the idea of what is *Laid down*—*Rests* or *Reposes*, as on the Base of the *Ground*, in a quiet — inactive state, as OT*iosus*, &c. Now we perceive, that the very explanatory term *Idle* bears at once the sense annexed to these words, of *Vain* — *Futile*, and is likewise connected with this idea of *Inactivity*. Such I imagine to be the metaphorical meaning annexed to these words ETOS, ETOSIOS, (Ετος, Frustra, Ετωσιος, Inanis); and thus we see, that they coincide in their original idea with ETOS, (Ετος, Annus,) the Year, and ETEOS, (Ετεος, Verus,) True, as being all derived from the notion of what is *Laid* or Fixed, as on a Base or Foundation, — so as to *Last* and *Endure* — To be Stable and Firm, or To *Rest* and *Repose* in a state of unprofitable inactivity.

inactivity. The very term *Otiosus* means in one of its senses, as R. Ainsworth explains it, "Insignificant, idle, of no value, "trifling." It is marvellous to observe, how words retain their original idea, and how they continue to be attached to the objects, from which they are taken. Now it is extremely curious, that the word Eтos*ios*, (Ετωσιος,) is actually associated in two passages of Homer with the *Ground*, under the idea of *Falling down*, or *Lying* down on the *Ground*. In one passage, Arrows are said to fall to the *Ground*—Eтos*ia*, (Ετωσια,) *Inert*, quasi *Otiosa*; and in another, a person is said to be Fixed to a certain Spot, like an Eтos*ion*—an *Inert Lump of Earth*, quasi *Otiosum* pondus *Terræ*.

Ἡμιν δ' αὐτως πασιν ΕΤΩΣΙΑ πιπτει ΕΡΑΖΕ. (*Il.* P. v. 633.)
Nobis vero incassum omnibus *Irrita* cadunt in *Terram*.

Αλλ' ἡμαι παρα νηυσιν ΕΤΩΣΙΟΝ αχθος ΑΡΟΥΡΗΣ. (*Il.* Σ. v. 104.)
Sed sedeo apud naves *Inutile* pondus *Terræ*.

This latter passage is indeed singularly curious. We cannot, I think, but perceive, that Eт-Os-*ios*, (Ετωσιος,) is a compound from Eт-*os*, (Ετος, Frustra,) quasi Eт-Eт. I have supposed, on a former occasion, that Es-Uch-*os*, (Ησυχος, Quietus,) is a compound of a similar kind; and I have compared it with two Persian words اسایش Asa-Ish, and اسودکي As-Udgi, bearing the same meaning. Perhaps in Eт-Es*ios*, (Ετησιος, Anniversarius,) Annual, we have likewise a compound from Eтos, (Ετος, Annus,) the year.

To this source we must probably refer a portion of a word, expressing the art, which belongs to the nature of these discussions—*Etymology*. It is derived, we know, from *Etumologia*, Ετυμολογια, which is compounded of *Etumos*, (Ετυμος, Verus,) 'True,' and *Logos*, (Λογος,) 'Speech, Discourse, Reason, Account,' &c. It is not quite easy to decide on the original idea annexed to this word. Cicero translates it by *Veriloquium*, and appears to be dissatisfied

dissatisfied with the composition. A term denoting *A Declaration of Truth*, if that be the meaning of the word, will be considered, I imagine, as applied with more than ordinary presumption to an Art, which the Artists have supplied with no principles, and which has commonly been regarded, as the most uncertain and perplexed of all Human investigations. In the ordinary definition of *Etymology*, that it " Teacheth rightly to know or distinguish " words or the parts of speech," it should seem, as if the meaning of the compound was conceived to be *The Truth respecting Speech or Words*. In the definitions of some, it should seem, as if *Logos*, (Λογος,) was supposed to signify, at the same time, a *Discourse declaring something*, and likewise *what relates to a Discourse;* so that, according to them, *Etymology* would signify ' A Discourse about True Discourse or Words,' or 'on the Truth of ' Discourse or Words' — Ετυμολογια ΛΟΓΟΣ επαληθιζομενην δεικνυς την ΛΕΞΙΝ τη φυσει του πραγματος. (*Eustath.* apud Martin.) Some conceive, that *Etymon*, (Ετυμον,) means " Vera nominis, sive appel- " lationis, ratio, vel quæ saltem pro verâ adfertur." This, we see, is giving a very ample sense indeed to the first portion of the compound. Perhaps the inventor of this word meant simply to express by *Etumologia*, (Ετυμολογια, Vera Ratio,) ' The True Nature ' or Relation of one thing to another;' and it was afterwards particularly applied to the *Relation of words* to each other, with respect to their formation. In this sense it is now acknowledged to be used, whatever might have been its original meaning.— I have wandered from the office of an Etymologist, in detailing the various opinions about the *meaning* of a word, when the consideration of that meaning was not connected with any question respecting its origin. Its origin from *Etumos*, (Ετυμος,) and *Logos*, or *Lego*, (Λογος, Λεγω,) is acknowledged.

We might however still enquire about the origin of *Etumos*, (Ετυμος.) In our ordinary Vocabularies, *Etumos* is considered as a Root;

a Root; yet some have seen, that the ET in this word belongs to ETos, (Ετος, Verus.) This, I imagine, is the fact; and in that case, the ET and EET in *Et-Eetumus*, or ET-EET-*Tumos*, (Ετητυμος) will be repetitions of the same Element, as in the cases produced above. If we should have doubted, whether the ET in *Etumos*, (Ετυμος,) belonged to the ET in *Etos*, (Ετος,) from the evidence only of this single word; our doubts would, I think, be removed, when we saw the other word *Et-Eetumos*, or ET-EET-*Tumos*, (Ετητυμος,) where the ET is unequivocally exhibited, as a separate and significant portion, belonging to ETos, (Ετος, Verus.) In the same opening of my Greek Vocabulary, where this latter word is, I see ESTia, (Εστια,) and ESTOOS, (Εστως,) belonging to ISTemi, (Ιστημι,) which shews us the origin from which the ET in these words is derived.—The ETon, (Ετον,) is the EST-os, (Εστος, Stans,) That which *Stands* Firm—or well Founded. We find likewise, in the same opening, ETes, ETairos, ETeros, (Ετης, Socius, Εταιρος, Sodalis, Ετερος, Alter,) the two former of which might have been directly referred to ETos, (Ετος, Verus,) under the idea of the Person *Truly* and Firmly Attached to another; but on account of the latter word, and its parallels, *Either*, *Other*, &c., which I shall produce on a future occasion, I refer them to the next sense of this race of words,—to the adjectives denoting Being, Is, (Lat.) &c., rather than to the original—the verbs of Being—EST, (Lat.) Is, (Eng.) &c., under their primitive idea. This distinction, which may appear to be too minute, and which indeed may be considered as such in many instances, is oftentimes necessary to be made.—We might now enquire respecting the origin of the TUM in *Etumos*, or ET-*Tum-os*, (Ετυμος.) The *Tum* belongs to another Element TM, denoting the Earth or Ground, under the same idea of the *Base* or *Foundation*. We see the force of this Element in the THEM of THEMelion, (Θεμελιον, Fundamentum.) The adjacent word ETOIMOS, (Ετοιμος, Paratus,) is only

only another form of ETUMOS, (Ετυμος,) with another turn of meaning, derived from the same metaphor of the *Base* or *Foundation*. This will be evident from a word belonging to it, which actually signifies *A Base* or *Foundation*, *Etoimasia*, (Ετοιμασια, Preparatio; *Basis, Sedes Firma, Fundamentum.*) To the same Element, under this idea, our word *Timber* belongs. Junius explains Timber by *Ædificare;* and Lye interprets the Saxon *Timber* by "*Timber*, Lignum, Materia, Arbor, — Structura, — "Ædificium," and *Timbran*, "Ædificare, struere, condere, fabri- "care." I shall not proceed farther at present in the illustration of this race of words.

ECAN. (Sax.) Augere.
AUGEO. (Lat.) To Increase, i. e. To Raise up or Establish any thing, as on a Foundation.

AUCTOR. (Lat.) The Founder, the Base, origin of any thing, — the Increaser, Enlarger, &c.

THE words preceding and following ECA, (Æternus,) in my Saxon Dictionary are "Ec, *Eke*, and ECAN, To *Eke*. Augere." All these words must surely belong to each other; and if that should be the case, EKE, Augere, must be referred to the idea of the *Base*. This seems very remote; but a little reflection will perhaps incline us to adopt this derivation. The sense of *Addition* may be derived from the idea of one thing *Proceeding from — Established* upon — Arising from or out of another, as on or from a *Base — Foundation* or *Source*. If the terms OUT and *Ex* are derived directly from the idea of the *Base*, EKE and OUT will belong to each other, as congenial terms. It is curious, that EKE is peculiarly attached to *Out;* — To EKE *Out;* — "*Ros.* The little "strength that I have, I would it were with you. *Cel.* And "mine to EKE *Out* hers." *(As You Like it.)* To EKE *Out* might have

'have conveyed the idea of To *Establish—Confirm—Strengthen;* and with the sense of the word *Established* before us, we shall see how EKE, *Augere*, and *Eca*, *Æternus*, may belong to each other. I produce EC, EKE, *Etiam*, in another place, with a race of words, which signify *This* or *That* Existing Being or Thing—or *This* or *That* Being or Thing in a certain *State* or *Position*.—Under this idea of conceiving it, we come to the same point. I shew, that IS, ITA, and EST, belong to each other; and thus EKE belongs to EAC*an*, To *Establish*, Raise up, Increase, as ITA belongs to ESSE, To be Fixed, Established, Placed, or Be.—Still however it is not always easy to adjust, whether the term belongs more directly to the original or the secondary idea; and therefore it is difficult to decide, in which class of words the term should be most properly arranged. I have supposed, that words signifying 'To Heal, Cure,' which belong to our Element, have been derived from the metaphor of *Establishing*, as on a firm *Base* or *Foundation;* such as we find it in our familiar phrase, 'To *Establish* the Health.' The Galic term, which I have produced, as bearing this sense, *Icam*, is interpreted in Mr. Shaw's Dictionary, by "To Heal, Cure; Supply, EEKE." Among the terms for *Increase*, in the first part of Robert Ainsworth's Dictionary, is *Astruo*, which directly conveys the idea of one thing *Established* or Built on another. "Astruo. To build near to, "or join one building to another.—Met. To Super-*Add*, or Accu-"mulate." So intimately is the idea of *Increase* connected with that of one thing proceeding from another, as the Origin, Stock, or Foundation, that Virgil uses the word *Incrementum*, *Increase*, for the *Off-Spring* of another, "Magnum Jovis *Incrementum*."—Another form of the Saxon EC is "EACAN, Addere, and EACA, Additamentum," as Lye explains them; and it is extremely curious, that the latter word, in another sense, signifies "Præ-"sidia," according to the same Lexicographer; where we actually

see

see the idea of the *Firm* or *Strong Establishment.* An adjacent term to this in Lye's Dictionary is Eac*nian*, Concipere, Parturire. I have supposed, on a former occasion, that the terms for a Father and Mother, *Atta*, *Aithei*, (Goth. &c.) are derived from the notion of the *Base—Source* or *Origin;* and I have shewn, that the term for Mother in Hebrew, אם AM, means a *Post*, *Pillar*, &c. &c. The English word *Yean*, and the parallel Saxon term *Eanian*, produced by the Etymologists, must surely belong to *Eacnian.*

To the same idea of the *Base*, &c. we must refer the Latin AUGEO, the explanatory word, to Ec*an*, To *Eke*, and the parallel Greek terms *Aexo*, *Auxo*, and *Auxano*, (Αεξω, Αυξω, Αυξανω.) The first sense, which Robert Ainsworth gives us of AUG*eo*, " To " Create or Make," " Quodcunque alias ex se res AUGET, alitque. " Lucret.," &c. &c., affords us the original idea. We here mark, how AUGEO is joined with *Ex*, and that the sense expressed by " quod AUGET alias res *Ex* se," what causes all other things to Proceed from itself, as a Source, or Foundation, brings us at once to the notion, which I have supposed in my Hypothesis. If the Reader should be already inclined to this opinion, what will his conviction be, when he remembers the word AUCTOR, which, as the Etymologists themselves agree, belongs to *Augeo*, and of which the leading idea, as every one knows, is that of the *Origin*, *Source*, *Foundation.* Robert Ainsworth explains AUCTOR by " Properly an Increaser, or Enlarger.—A *Father*, *Founder*, or " *Principal person.*—Primus Pater Urbis et AUCTOR," &c. &c. Here we have every thing, which could be desired, to confirm an Hypothesis. From hence, we know, are derived AUTHOR, AUTHORITY, *Auctoritas*, &c., and their parallel terms in modern Languages. The word *Ground* is used, we know, for the original Cause; and Shakspeare has combined *Grounds* in the plural with AUTHORS, under a similar idea:

" But, when we know the *Grounds* and AUTHORS of it."
(*Twelfth Night*, at the end of A. 5.)

Robert Ainsworth has connected the idea of *Increase*, annexed to AUGEO, with that of the *Foundation*, or of the AUCTOR; and his explanation nearly coincides with my conceptions on the word; though I have supposed a different order, "Quia AUGERE fit "creando, efficiendo, vel instituendo, aliquid, Patris, effectoris, et "institutoris, notionem habet." Let us mark the explanatory term *Instituo*, which belongs to the same metaphor of *Settling* or *Establishing* on its proper Base or Stand. The Latin AUCTIO, The *Auction*, the Sale, is supposed to be derived from the sense of Increase; *Augendi* actus. Whether this be the precise idea, by which these terms are connected, I cannot decide.—According to the explanation now given, the sense of *Augeo* should appear somewhat after this manner in our Latin Lexicons, 'To *Set* one 'thing *Up-On* or *To* another; as a Super-Structure, on a *Base* or '*Substratum, Adstruere;* To Raise up—Promote or Advance any 'thing, as proceeding from its *Source* or *Origin*. Hence, to 'Raise—Advance—Promote—Add to—Increase, in general.' AUCTOR should be explained thus: 'The Original *Founder* or '*Establisher* of any thing:—the AUTHOR, &c.—the *Origin*, '*Source*, from which any thing Proceeds—is Raised:—the '*Setter* up or Promoter of any thing,' &c. &c.

Terms denoting a *Dwelling*—*Habitation*, &c., derived from the idea of the Appropriate certain or fixed Spot, EARTH, ARK, &c., on which a person is *Situated*—*Settled*—*Established*, &c.

HOUSE—HUS—HUUS—HUYS—HAUS, &c. (Eng. Sax. Goth. and Run. Dan. Belg. Germ. &c.) The Spot or Place, on which a person is Situated.

HUSBAND—HUSBANDMAN, Locum Colens.

HUT—ÆDES—OIKOS, (Eng. Lat. Gr.) The *House*.

ESTIA. (Greek.) The *Hearth*, *House*,

House, the Goddess of the *Earth*, or

v-ESTA.

Is*is*. The Goddess of the *Earth*.

HOSTERY — HOTEL, &c. &c. (Eng. &c.) The *House*.

HOST, HÔTE, HOTELIER, &c. (Eng. Fr. &c.) The Master of the Inn.

HOSPES. (Lat.) The Receiver and the Received in the *House*.

HOST*is*. (Latin.) Originally a Stranger, from the idea of the Person received into the *House*.—Afterwards An enemy, from the idea of the Stranger.

OSB. (Welsh.) A guest.

OSDA. (Gal.) An Inn.

g-OSPOD-*are*, *g*-OSOUD-*are*, (Russ.) Master, Sir, Prince, &c.

g-OST-*innitsa*. (Russ.) An Inn.

g-OCHTCHOU. (Russ.) I entertain.

g-UEST — *g*-AST, &c. (Eng. Germ.) The Person received into the *House*.

HOSTIO. (Lat.) Par pari refero, derived from *Hostis*, the enemy.

HOSTIA. (Latin.) The Victim, offered on a victory over the *Hostis* or Enemy.

HOSTIE—HOST. (French, Eng.) The consecrated Wafer, representing the body of Christ, the *Hostia*, or Victim.

HUSEL — HUNSL. (Sax. Goth.) Victima, Sacrificium.

Un-HOUSEL'D. (English.) Not having received the Sacrament.

HOSTAGE—OTAGE—OTAGGIO. (Eng. Fr. Ital.) The person demanded of the *Hostis*.

Obses, quasi OSES. (Lat.) The Hostage.

HOST—OST — OSTE. (Eng. Fr. Ital.) An army.

THE terms, which relate to *Place*, and which signify To be *Placed*—*Situated*—*Settled*—To be *Fixed*, as in a certain *Stand*—*Position*—*Seat*—To Rest—Lie—Sit—*Abide*—*Dwell*, &c. &c., would be naturally derived, as all will agree, from the certain *Spot* of EARTH—

or

or from the EARTH or *Ground*, in which this Place or Position must necessarily be found. From hence would be derived, as we shall all likewise readily acknowledge, the names of the *Dwellings* and Habitations of men, where they are *Placed — Situated — Settled*, or EARTH'D, if I may so express it. We have seen, that the word, adjacent to the Saxon EARD, The EARTH, is EARD*ian*, or EARD*igan*, Habitare, which, as we see, literally signifies *To* EARTH; and from hence is derived the Saxon EARD*ung*, Habitatio, Tabernaculum. I shall here collect the words, conveying this train of ideas, which appear under our Element ^C, ^D, ^G, &c. &c. In a former part of this Work I considered those words, which were derived from the certain — peculiar or appropriate Spot of EARTH or Ground, considered as an *Enclosure;* and the Reader will perceive, that the terms, which I have now explained to be the objects of my present discussion, might have been introduced with equal propriety in that part. — In terms of this sort, denoting the Appropriate Spot, on which men are *Settled — Fixed — Dwell*, &c., these ideas of the *Enclosure* and the *Establishment* are entangled often with each other.—It will be instantly granted, that HOUSE and its parallel terms are to be referred to the notion of the E*r*s, E*r*z, the EA*r*TH, or Spot, on which a person is *Situated* or *Abides*. HOUSE is to be found in various Languages, as in the Saxon — Gothic and Runic *Hus*, the Danish *Huus*, the Belgic *Huys*, the German *Haus*, &c., most of which the Etymologists have produced. Again, in Gothic, HEIWA is Domus, which is probably quasi HEIWAG. Junius has properly compared these words with the Greek E*zein*, (Εζειν,) which he explains by " Ponere, Statuere, " Collocare;" and this relation he justly compares with the Greek Δομος or Δωμα, from Δεμω, or Δωμαω, Extruo, Ædifico. I have referred *Domos*, (Δομος,) to the Element DM, denoting the Ground. The HUST*ings* is the temporary HOUSE or Building for transacting public business. Spelman derives it from HUS, Domus,

Domus, and *Thing*, Causa, Lis. Whether the latter part be just, I cannot decide. Some derive the HUST from *Hausser*, Attollere, Elevare, quasi Alta et Excelsa Curia, and others from the Saxon *Hyhst*, Supremus, and *Thing*, Judicium.

With the idea of the HOUSE — the certain Spot of *Ground*, which a person possesses, we annex the various ideas, with which that Possession or Establishment is connected; such as the *Management* of Affairs in the Dwelling, and in the Cultivation of annexed Ground. Hence we have Hus*band* — HUS-*Wife* — and HUS*band-Man*, the Master and Mistress of the Establishment, the Cultivator of the *Ground* or *Land*. Some derive HUS-*Band* from HUS and *Band*, q. d. Domus Vinculum; and others from HUS and *Bonda*, Pater familias, Maritus. A similar composition appears in the Danish Hosz *bonde*, "Herus, Dominus." We cannot doubt, that HUSBAND, Maritus, and HUSBAND, Œconomus, HUSBAND-*Man*, Agricola, have the same origin. The difficulty is to decide, from what idea BAND is derived. Junius says, that in Danish, *Bonde* or *Bendemand* is Colonus, "ac talis quidem, qui "alteri operam suam locat." This appears to bring us to *Bond*, The tie, contract, bargain, &c. Junius however accurately explains the sense of our English term *Husbandman*, by "Patrem "familias agrorum culturâ se suosque sustentantem." He seems to imagine, that the *Band* or *Bond* belongs to *Buende* in the Saxon *Land Buende*, which he explains by "Terram inhabitantes colentesque, à *Byan*, Inhabitare, Colere. This, I think, is just. He refers us likewise to the ancient Runic word *Buandmanne*, Coloni; and he observes, that from the participle *Buand*, Colens, has been formed by contraction *Bund*, Rusticus. The proper form of the participle is BU*Gend*, or *Bigend*, as we have it in Lye, *Land-Buend* or *Bugend*, *Lond-Bigend*, belonging to the Element *BG*, as in the Saxon *Bigan*, Colere, *Bigangan*, Colere, *Byggan*, Ædificare. From these our name *Biggin* is derived. When the sound

sound of *G* is lost, we have the Saxon *Bian*, Habitare,—the Dutch *Bouwen*, recorded by Junius, and the German *Bauen*, To Build, &c.—The *Husband* and *Husbandman* literally signify The Band, Bund, *Buand*, the *Farmer*, belonging to the Hus—the Spot on which a person is situated, comprehending at once the *Building*, in which he dwells, which we now call House, and the Place or Land attached to it. The word *Place* has the same meaning, as 'In Such a Person's *Place*,' that is, the *Building*, in which he actually Dwells, and the Property belonging to it. We perceive, how *Byan* signifies "Inhabitare et Colere." We cannot separate the Dweller on the Land from the Cultivator; and hence *Colo* signifies "To Till, *Husband*, Ground," as R. Ainsworth explains it; and "To Inhabit, live, or dwell in" it. Hence Hus*Band* and Hus*band Man* would be safely rendered by "Locum Colens," with the double meaning, annexed to *Colens*, which appears in *Band*, &c.

We likewise find exhibited among the parallel terms to House, &c., the English Hut—the Latin *Æde*s, and the Greek Oikos, (Οικος, Domus,) and Est*ia*, (Εστια, Focus, Lar, (2.) Domus.) Hut occurs in various Languages, as in the Saxon *Hutte*, the Islandic *Hydda*, the German *Hůtte*, which the Etymologists produce, and justly refer to the idea conveyed by the German Hůt*en*, To take Heed, beware, have a care, &c. This brings us to the race of words, which I have before illustrated, denoting the certain Spot of Earth or *g*-Uard*ed* Place—protected and secured by Fences, &c. These ideas are perpetually passing into each other, and cannot on many occasions be separated or distinguished.—In Skinner's Index of Forensic words, we have Haga, Domus, which he derives from the Saxon *Hegian*, *Sepire*, and Hedge. In this portion of my Work, I am employed in considering those terms, in which the idea of Safety or Security is not particularly prominent; yet we shall find, that this notion must

must frequently present itself. The Latin *Ædes* has been derived from Εσθιω, "quod ibi edere soleamus,"—from αιδια, "perpetua, "seu ordinaria nostra mansio: vel quod αει δυομεν, semper in- "gredimur, seu subimus," &c. Some however have referred us to the Greek Edos, (Εδος,) and others have reminded us of the Greek Aisones, (Αισονες,) and Aisomenos, (Αισομενος,) which are explained by Φραγμοι, *Sepes*, and Φραξομενος, *Septurus*, "Primæ "Ædes," says Martinius, "absque dubio fuerunt *Septa*, et *Septa* "Latini quoque dicunt omnia loca munita, unde et Lucretius, "lib. i. *Septa domorum*." Here it is impossible to decide, whether *Ædes* conveys simply the idea expressed by Edos, (Εδος,) The Place or Position—the Earth, Erde, &c., or is connected with that expressed by Huten—the secured Earth—the *y*-Ard—the *g*-Uard-*ed* or *w*-Atched Place, &c. &c. To attempt any distinction of this sort, in cases like the present, would be an idle and unnecessary refinement. The Greek Oikos, (Οικος,) is accompanied by terms, which relate to *Settling*—or Fixing on any *Spot* or *Place*, as Oikizo, Οικιζω, In Ædibus, seu *Sede colloco;*—Loco, Colloco;—Coloniam in Locum mitto. Though it is not a portion of my duty to note a peculiar sense in words, which is not connected with points of Etymology, yet I cannot forbear remarking a coincidence of meaning between the English House and the Greek Oikos, (Οικος.) In English, House is used to denominate a peculiar part of the whole House or *Dwelling*. In Warwickshire it is used for the Kitchen—in the North, says Mr. Grose, for "The room called the Hall," and "House-*Place* "for the common room in a farm House." In Greek, Oikos, (Οικος,) is in like manner used for a particular apartment. Lucian, we know, has a treatise, Περι του Οικου, De *Oeco*. The readers of Vitruvius will find, that the Latins have adopted this word, to express a portion of the House—either the room, in which the mistress

mistress of the family performed her spinning, &c., (Lib. vi. c. 10.) or the Saloon for dining. (Lib. vi. c. 5, 6.)

ESTIA, (Εστια, Focus, Lar;—*Domus*,) not only denotes the *Hearth*, but the HOUSE. Let us note the word HEARTH, which I have before produced, and which, as we shall all agree, signifies the EARTH or *Ground*. The Etymologists refer us to the Saxon *Heorth*, and the Belgic *Haerd*, *Heerd*, *Heert*, *Hert*, *Hertstede*, the German *Herd*, &c.; and they record likewise the German *Hertha*, the Terra Mater, the Greek *Estia*, (Εστια,) and the Latin *Vesta*. In Gothic, HAURJA is "Focus, carbo."—We shall now understand, whence it is, that ESTIA or *Vesta* is at once the Fire-Place—or the Goddess of Fire, and the Goddess of the EARTH. To proceed from the humble Fire-Place to the Goddess of the *Earth*, seems at the first view a large stride; but we see these ideas inseparably united in the EARTH. The Greek EST*ia* or ERST*ia* is at once the *h*-EARTH and the EARTH. Some consider VESTA as the name of two Goddesses, which they derive from different sources. The one—the Goddess of Fire, they derive from *Estia*, (Εστια, Focus,) the Fire-place, and אש AS, *Ignis*, &c. &c.; and the other—the Goddess of the *Earth*, from *Estanai*, (Εσταναι, Statuere,) denoting the Foundation, &c. Martinius records on this occasion the Syriac אשתי ASTI, Fundare. Let us note the Greek IST*emi*, (Ιστημι, Colloco, Statuo,) and the Syriac ASTI, which belong likewise, as we have seen, to our Element ^S, ^T, &c., denoting the *Ground*.—We perceive, that the adjacent words to *Vesta*, as *Vestibulum*, the *Vestibule*, and *Vestigium*, belong to the *Vest* or EST, the *Ground*, the part, on which we *Tread;* and it would be idle to enquire, whether these words are attached to the Element V—S or ^S. We here see, how these forms pass into each other. The adjacent word *Vest*is, the Covering, with its corresponding term Est*hes*, (Εσθης,) is attached to the ESTIA, (Εστια,) the Ground, under the idea of the *Surface*—

the

the Top—the Superficial Covering. The Etymologists derive these words from *Velis*—from *Vellus* and *Vello*—from *Væ* and Εννυσθαι,—from Εω, "Mitto, quia immittitur." The adjacent word to *Esthes*, (Εσθης, Vestis,) the Covering, Esthio, (Εσθιω, Edo, comedo;—Absumo,) and its parallel terms *Edo*, (Εδω,) Gr. and Lat. *Eat*, &c. &c., are taken from the idea of *Fretting* or Vellicating a Surface—as of the EARTH.

It is foreign from the purpose of these discussions to detail the Mythological History of the Goddess *Vesta* or ESTIA, (Εστια); yet we must remember, that among the Goddesses of the EARTH, with whom VESTA is confounded, the Mythologists record *Rhea*, *Ceres*, *Proserpine*, *Cybele*, *Ops*, *Tellus*, and *Isis*. Let us note in this catalogue the Goddess Isis, which, we shall now see, belongs to our Element, and is only another form of Estia, (Εστια,) the EARTH, EIS, &c. &c. Amidst all the fables respecting the Goddess ISIS, the idea of her presiding over the fertility of the *Earth* is still predominant. The Greeks compared her with *Ceres;* and even when she was represented among the Ægyptians under the character of the Moon, she was imagined to be the cause of the *Earth's Fertility*. "Eam cum Græcorum Cerere "conferunt," says Jablonski, "Cereremque appellitant. Illam enim "*Terræ Fertilitatem*, quam *Cereri* suæ, numini maximo, Græci "in acceptis ferebant, Ægyptii ascribebant Lunæ." (Jablonski de Iside, §. 3.) Among the Ægyptians, however, ISIS was the name of the EARTH. "Præter ISIDEM cœlestem, quæ Luna est, "religiose quoque colebant" (Ægyptii,) "terrestrem, ipsam sci-"licet *Terram*, quæ proinde ISIDIS nomine designabatur," as Jablonski observes, who, among various well-known authorities, which prove this fact, produces the following testimony of Macrobius: "ISIS est vel *Terra*, vel *natura rerum* subjacens soli.—"ISIS nihil aliud est, quam *Terra, naturave rerum*," and that of Servius, who expressly says, that ISIS signifies the EARTH in the

Language of the Ægyptians: "Isis linguâ Ægyptiorum est *Terra*." (Ibid. §. 7. 9.)—We shall now understand, why As*is* in Greek signifies *Mud*, *Dirt*, (Ασις, Limus, sordes, cœnum.) To this word belongs the ΑΣΙΩ εν λειμωνι, the Prolific meadow, the meadow abounding with *rich Soil*, as some of the Scholiasts have conjectured. Hence is derived the quarter of the World, called Asia, the Country, the Earth—the prolific, fertile Land.

The ancient word Host*ery*, and the modern word Hot*el*, signify the House. The Etymologists produce the parallel terms *Hostelry*, (Eng.) *Hosterie*, *Hostellerie*, (Fr.) *Hosteria*, (Ital. and Span.); and Skinner derives them from the French *Hostel*, "ant. "Domus, nunc Aula, Palatium." The French *Hôtel*, we know, signifies "A Nobleman's or Gentleman's House.—A Large Inn.—"A large Lodging-House," as my Lexicographer explains it. Hostel is still used in our University, as the name of a Public Building in Trinity College; and it may either mean, in its first sense, 'The Great House or Building,' or, in its secondary sense, 'The Inn—The *Lodging*-House.' In Italian, Ostello, Ostelliere, not only means "An Inn, or Abode, Lodging," or, as I have explained it, the appropriate Spot, on which a person is Fixed—Settled—Established, or *Founded*, if I may so express it; but *Ostelo* likewise denotes the *Foundation* part of a thing, "as the "Stalk, Blade, *Stem*, or Shank of a Plant," as my Lexicographer interprets the word. The *Host*, *Hôte*, *Hôtelier*, *Oste*, *Ostiere*, *Ostellano*, *Hostalero*, (Eng. Fr. Ital. Span.) is the Master of the *Hostery* or *Hotel*. The *Hostler*, which meant the *Hôtelier*, or chief person of the Inn, is now applied to the person who takes care of the Horses. Skinner produces the Law term Horstilers, which he explains by Caupones. Junius, under Hoste, produces a Scotch word of the same meaning, Oist, used by Gawin Douglas; and Lye, under this latter term, gives us, as parallel, the Armoric Ostis. Junius moreover observes, "Qui certi

"aliquid

" aliquid de eorum origine," HOSTE, *Hosterie*, &c.; " statuere " volet, recurrat ad illa, quæ Vossii Etymologicon habet in *Hospes* " et *Hostis*."

We shall now understand, that Hos*pes* is the HOST, or the HÔTE, which in French signifies both the Landlord and the Guest.—Hos*pes*, we know, has this double meaning, and denotes at once the Entertainer and the Entertained in the HOUSE. Vossius derives Hos*pes* from HOST*is*, which signified, in the ancient Latin Language, a *Stranger*. Thus we see, that HOST*is*, the Enemy, meant originally the *Stranger*, who came to your HOUSE. It afterwards signified an Enemy, from the idea of a *Stranger*. Unless this original sense of HOSTIS had been preserved, how vain would all our conjectures have proved, respecting the origin of the word! " HOSTIS," says Festus, " apud antiquos " *Peregrinus* dicebatur, et qui nunc HOSTIS, Perduellis." The origin of HOSTIS, Vossius owns to be, " satis-obscurum;" and he adds, " nec quicquam melius occurrit, quam ut sit ab ος τις, *quivis*, " *quicunque*, vel potius, quod etiam Martinio videbatur, ab *Ostium*, " ut notet eum, qui *foris* est, hoc est, extra tentorium nostrum, " ut qui alienis legibus utatur."

To Hos*pes* belongs, we know, *Hospitalis*, and the words in modern Languages, *Hospitable*, *Hospitalier*, *Ospitale*, (Eng. Fr. Ital.) &c. Hence we have the *Hospital*, the place of reception for the necessitous, &c., *Hospice*, (Fr.) *Hôpital*, (Fr.) *Spedale*, (Ital.) and the corruption in English, *Spittal*. Robert Ainsworth derives *Hospes* from *Sospes*, " quia *Hospes* cum *Hospite* tutus esse " debet;" but he derives *Hostis* from the Celtic *Osb* seu *Osp*, a term, as he says, of the same meaning. A Celtic derivation from a Latin Etymologist is an extraordinary effort in the prosecution of his art. Under HOSPES, Lhuyd produces the Welsh *Osp*, *Ostis*, and the Irish *Ostaire*. Mr. Richards explains the Welsh " OSB. " A Guest. pl. YSB;" and an adjacent word is OSEB, " A hansel, a " present,

" present, a gift." In the next column I find OSTRI, *Cadw* OSTRI, To keep open HOUSE, and OSWYDD, Enemies, &c., which belongs to HOSTIS. In Mr. Shaw's Irish and Galic Dictionary I find " OSDA. An Inn. OSDAIR. An Inn-holder, HOST, Landlord;" and " OSTOIR. An OSTLER." To HOSPES belong the Sclavonic titles of respect, corresponding with the German *Herr*,—the English *Sir*—the French *Monsieur*, &c., such as *g*-OSPOD*are*, *g*-OSPOD*ine*, *g*-O*soudare*, &c. &c. The precise meaning of the OS, or *g*-OS, in these words, is not the HOUSE, but its more general idea, the *Spot* on which a person is Fixed or Settled—which he owns or Possesses; and the *g*-OSPOD*are* exactly corresponds with our word *Land*-Lord, or Land-Holder. Thus we see, as HOST, the Master of the HOUSE passes into the Master of the Inn; so *Land-Lord*, from the idea of the owner of the *Land*, passes into the sense of the owner of the *Inn*. We have seen, in HUS*band* and HUS*bandman*, how the HOUSE and *Land* are connected. My Russian and German Dictionary explains *g*-OSPODA by " die Herrschaften," which signifies 'Lordships—Seignories,' &c. —*g*-OSPOSDARE by "Ist der titel der fürsten in der Wallachey " und Moldau," or, 'It is the Title of Princes in Wallachia and 'Moldavia,' *g*-OSPODI*ne*, " Der Herr," the Lord, Master, &c. *g*-OSOUD*are*, " der regierende Herr, der Monarch, ein titel der " jeder Mannsperson beygelegt wird," 'the reigning Lord, the 'Monarch; a title which is attached to every Male.' Again, *g*-OST*innitsa* is explained by " *Gaft-haus*," An Inn, which conveys the same idea as HOST*ery*, &c. We have likewise the Sclavonic " *g*-OCHTCHOU, Ich bewirthe," I entertain, and " *g*-OCHTCH*enie*, " Die bewirthung," An Entertaining, &c. I here represent a Russian letter by *Chtch*, as I am directed by my French Grammarian. Let us mark the German *g*-AST, corresponding with the English *g*-UEST, which is only another form of the OS, or *h*-OS, in *h*-OSP*es*—*h*-OT*e*, (Fr.) &c.

The

The Latin Hostio, *referre* gratiam, To return like for like, may be derived, as some Etymologists have observed, from Hostis, the Stranger received as a *Guest*, "ut sit, pendo et solvo, quem-"admodum Hostis, (ὁ καταλυτης,) solet, pro officio curæ in "*Hospitio* impensæ." Yet Hostio may be taken from Hostis, under the idea of treating as an Enemy, returning *Tit* for *Tat*, as we express it, or of 'giving a person a Rowland for his 'Oliver,' according to another of our expressions. In a passage of Ennius, as Scaliger reads it, we have

"Quem mea comminus machæra atque hasta Hostivit è manu."

And again in Pacuvius, quoted by Festus, as some read it:

"Nisi coërceo protervitatem, atque Hostio ferociam."

In these instances we have the idea of violent actions, as connected with the Hostis, or *Enemy*. From the notion of *returning like for like*, Hostire is translated by some *Æquare*, in a sense, where nothing of violence is understood; and hence are derived Hostorium, "Lignum, quo modius *æquatur*," and Hostus, "Men-"sura quædam in re oleariâ"—the just—*equal* measure.

The Latin Hostia, the Victim, or Sacrifice, was supposed originally to have been that, which was offered on obtaining Victory over the Hostis or Enemy. From hence is derived Hostie, the Host, the consecrated wafer, representing the body of Christ,—the great Sacrifice or Victim for the sins of Mankind. To the Hostia, Hostie, belongs, I imagine, the Saxon Husel, &c., and the Gothic *Hunsl*, &c., "Victima Sacrificium;" and hence we have the old English word Housel, "the Sacrament, *Un*-"Housel'd, disappointed, unaneld." Skinner derives Husel-*Gang*, "Sacramenti Eucharistiæ perceptio," in his Appendix of Law terms, from Husel and *Gange*, Aditus; and Husel, as he informs us, is derived by Somner from *Hostia*; though he adds, "Mallem Hostiola," which is probably the precise case. The *Hostage*, *Otage*, *Ostaggio*, is supposed to be the person demanded

manded of the Hostis or Enemy. Skinner adds, likewise, another derivation; in which he seems to refer these words to the Latin *Obses*, as he explains them by *Obses;* and adds, moreover, "q. d. *Obsidagium* vel *Hospitagium*, quia *Obses* instar *Hospitis* "est." Some consider *Obsides* to be quasi "*Obfides*, quia ob "*fidem* patriæ præstandam dantur." Others imagine, that the *Obses* is derived from *Obsidio*, "quia *Obsidionis* gratiâ dari con- "suevit." The *B* in *Obses* may be an organical addition to the *S;* and the *Oses*, *Osid*-is, may coincide with *Hostage*, *Otage*, &c. The *b* and *p* appear after the S in *Osb*, and *Hospes;* but in *Obses* the *b* precedes. Our word Host, A Company, Army, the Etymologists derive from *Hospes*, and produce, as parallel, the French *Host*, *Ost*, and the Italian *Hoste*, or *Oste*. In Italian, Oste is "An Army, and a Guest." While I am examining the word *Ost* or *Host* in Menage, I cast my eyes on Oster, or Oter, which Menage derives from *Haurire*, *Hausi*, &c., and others from *Cthein*, (Ωθεω, Trudere.) The latter may be the true derivation; that is, it may be referred to this term, and other similar words, which I shall produce with *Otheo*, (Ωθεω,) on another occasion. But if Mr. *Caseneuve* is right in supposing, that the original sense of *Oster* or *Oter* was "Defendre à quelqu'un le chemin, et s'opposer "au passage," it may be derived from *Obsto*, as he imagines. It seems from his quotations to be directly taken from *Obsto*, as used in barbarous Latin: "Si quis—de viâ suâ *Obstaverit*, &c. Si "Porcarius de viâ suâ *Ostatus* vel battutus fuerit."

I shall now proceed to examine a race of words, which may be regarded, as at once the most familiar and the least understood, in the construction of Languages. The Reader will advance with care, and, I trust, with candour, in the prosecution of this Enquiry; which professes to unfold a series of truths, totally remote from all former conceptions, on the affinity of words in the formation of Human Speech.

CHAP. II.

SECT. III.

^C, ^D, ^G, &c. &c.

Terms denoting Existence, *derived from the idea of that, which is* Placed, Set, Situated, Stands up, &c. &c., *as* Ist-amai, (Ιστημι, *Colloco, Statuo;—at in Aor.* 2. *perf. plusq. perf. Sto, Consisto;—* Esse, *Natum, Ortum* Esse;—*quæ vis et in med.* Ισταμαι *obtinet,*) *the Verb of Being,* Est, (*Lat.*) Is, (*Eng.*) *&c. &c. Demonstrative and other Pronouns, denoting the* Existing *Being or Thing, the Being or Thing so* Placed—Situated, *&c.* This—*or* That *Being, Thing, &c. &c., as* Iste, Hic, Is, *(Lat.)* It, *(Eng.)* Ego, *(Lat.)* Os, (Ος, *Qui,*) *&c. &c. Adverbs, Prepositions, Conjunctions, &c. which either directly express* This *or* That—Situation, State, &c., *or are ultimately derived from words, conveying such ideas, as* Ita, *(Lat.)* Ad, *(Lat.)* At, *(Eng.)* Ut, *(Lat.) &c. &c.*

IN

IN this Section I shall consider a great race of words, under the form ^C, ^D, ^G, ^J, ^K, ^Q, ^S, ^T, ^X, ^Z, as EST, (Lat.) Is, (Eng.) &c. ISTE, HIC, IS, EGO, &c. &c., (Lat.) which denote *Being* or *Existence*, and which I conceive to be derived from the idea of that, which is *Placed—Situated—Stands up*, &c. These notions may seem on the first view remote from each other; but we shall instantly understand, that they have been perpetually connected in the most familiar and acknowledged instances.—The very term *Existence*, which I have adopted on this occasion, is acknowledged to be derived from *Sisto*, which relates, as we know, to *Place* or *Position*. R. Ainsworth explains *Sisto* by "To *Set*, to be made to *Stand*.—To Continue.—To *Settle*,—to "*Place*, or Set up." I have supposed, that the words, belonging to our Element, ^C, ^D, ^G, &c., which denote *Position*, *Place*, &c., have been derived from the EARTH, or EA^RTH—the ESTIA, (Εστια, Focus, Lar;—Domus;—Ara;—Asylum;—VESTA, Dea;—Sedes, v. g. Imperii,) &c. &c., the *Ground*, the Firm, Fixed Spot, or *Seat*, on which things are *Situated—Set*, *Put*, *Placed*, &c. Among these terms denoting *Situation—Place* or *Position*, which belong to the Element ^C, ^D, &c. without the *r*, I have classed Ez-*omai*, (Εζομαι, Sedeo,) and Ist-*emi*, (Ιστημι, Colloco, Statuo; In Aor. 2. perf. plusq. perf. Sto, Consisto, Unde *Est;—Esse*, Natum, Ortum *Esse*.) In the latter word, IST*emi*, (Ιστημι,) we have the same union of the ideas of *Existence* and *Position*, which I have supposed in my Hypothesis; and we perceive, likewise, that EST is among the explanatory terms. In the Latin *Sto*, and in some of its parallel words, *Stand*, (Eng.) *Stehen*, (Germ.) &c., the vowel breathing is lost before the $\overline{\text{ST}}$; but in others it is again found, as in the Spanish EST*ar*. This Spanish word EST*oy*, EST*as*, EST*a*, &c. is the familiar auxiliary verb, corresponding with *Sum*, Es, EST; and this word still bears the original sense of *Place* or *Position*. Mr. Neuman justly explains EST*ar* by "To be in a *Place*." The Italian

Italian *Star*, To Stand, is used in a similar manner for *To Be*, 'Come 'Sta V. S.—*Star* bene, Sono *Stato*,' 'How Is your worship, To *Be* 'well, I have *Been*;' and in German, *Stehen* means To *Be*.

Hence are derived the *Demonstrative* and other Pronouns, belonging to our Element, which denote *Being*, as referred to *Living* animals, or which relate to *Things—Being*, or *Existing*, in certain *States*, *Positions*, &c.—as Is, Id, Hic, Hæc, Hoc, Iste, Ista, Istud. All this is plain and intelligible. As the verbs Est, Is, (Lat. Eng.) denote the same as *Existit*, so Is, Id, (Lat.) It, (Eng,) Hic, Hæc, Hoc, Iste, Ista, Istud, Ego, &c., correspond with *Existens*, as denoting the *Existing Being* or *Thing*; that is, I conceive, that certain terms, belonging to our Element ^C, ^D, &c., which now perform the part of Pronouns, Demonstrative, Personal, or Relative, as they are called, such as Is, Id, Iste, (Lat.) &c. &c., Ego, (Lat.) &c., Os, (Gr. Ος,) &c., originally belonged to the verb of Being, under that Element, as Est, &c. &c., with a relation in point of meaning similar to that, which the Participle may be conceived to bear to its verb; so that Is, Iste, Ego, &c. &c., were quasi Is=*Ens*, Iste=*Ens*, Ego=*Ens*, or Ess-*Ens*, &c. As I conceive that Est, the verb of Being, has precisely the same metaphorical signification as *Existit*; so, according to my idea, Is, Iste, &c., being in their original meaning quasi Is=*Ens*, Iste=*Ens*, Ego=*Ens*, bore precisely the same relation to Est, as *Exist=Ens* does to *Existit*. When we speak of *Existing* beings or things, that is, of beings or things *Placed in a certain state;* it is for the purpose of expressing that state by way of *declaration*, *comparison*, or *distinction* in *different* or *distinct* persons or things; and hence we see, how terms denoting the *Existing* Being or Thing, receive the idea of *Demonstrative* parts of Speech, and of Personal Pronouns, denoting *This*, *That* Existing Being or Thing, or *This*, *That* in general; as *Exist=Ens*, Is=*Ens*, Iste=*Ens*, Ridet; *Exist=Ens*, Is=*Ens*, Iste=*Ens*, Is, Iste

Ridet; Is, Iste *Flet*, Ego=*Ens*, Ego Rideo, Fleo.—We see, how from this source words have assumed different forms, and have been applied to different purposes and persons. In Is, Iste, &c., we see the forms, which the term denoting the *Existing Being* assumes, when the speaker refers to others; and in Ego, we have the form, when he refers to himself.—The Relative Pronoun, we know, is nothing but the Demonstrative Pronoun, applied in a different manner; and it is accordingly perpetually connected with it, as every one understands. In English, as in many other Languages, the same term is both Demonstrative and Relative,—'*That* is a man, *That* I esteem.'

I shall consider likewise, in this Section, other parts of speech, as the Adverb—Conjunction, and Preposition, which belong to our Element, and which are derived from the same idea of *Situation—Place—Position*, or of any Animal or Thing *Existing*, or being *Situated—Placed*, &c., in *This* or *That Situation—Place —Position*, *State*, &c. It will be found, that such words are more or less remote from their original idea, or that some words refer more immediately to the idea of *Place* or *Situation;* while in others, the idea has disappeared, and they denote merely *Being*, or perform the part of *Demonstrative Adjectives—Adverbs*, &c. Thus *Estar*, and *Star*, as we have seen, though they relate to *Being* or *Existence*, still retain their original sense of *Situation* or *Place*. The term *Existence*, though it is known to be derived from the same idea, yet we see, that the notion of *Place* is not so apparent in its ordinary use, and even the substitution of that original notion would seem strange and perhaps improper. I make this observation, that the Reader, when I refer any term to its original notion, may be prepared to understand, that it is done for the purpose of illustration only, and not under the conception, that the original notion most aptly expresses the present use of the term, which has been thus illustrated. I shall, nevertheless,

theless, sometimes recur to this mode of illustration, however uncouth it may appear, that the Reader may be constantly alive to the original idea, from which this race of words is derived. And I must observe, moreover, that, in most cases, this mode of illustration will be sufficiently appropriate and intelligible.—Again I must repeat, that I do not pretend to unravel the links of the chain, by which one word has passed into another, nor to define the distance, at which any of these links may be placed from the original idea. It is curious to observe in Spanish, how ESTAR, which is directly connected with the sense of *State* or *Situation*, is applied to objects, where that idea most predominates; and how *Ser*, belonging to *Soi*, I am, being somewhat remoter from this original sense, is applied in a more abstract manner. My Grammarian thus distinguishes between the different uses of these verbs of Being: "*Ser* signifies the proper and inseparable "Essence of a thing, its quality or quantity; as *Ser hombre*, to "be a man; *Ser valiente*, to be courageous; *Ser alto*, to be tall; "*Ser chico*, to be little: but *Estar* denotes a *Place*, or any "adjunct quality; as *Estar en Londres*, to be in London; *Estar* "*con salud*, to be in health; *Estar enfermo*, to be sick. So *Estar* "is used to express and denote any affection or passion of the "soul, or any accidental quality of a thing; as *Estar Enojado*, "to be angry; *Esta mesa Es buena*, pero *Está mal hecha*, This "table is good, but it is ill made; where you may see the "essential being of the table expressed by the verb *Ser*, and the "accidental by the verb *Estar*." This distinction is in many cases too minute to be perceived; yet it is certain, that *Ser* and *Estar* are not used promiscuously, and that the turn of meaning annexed to *Estar* is that, which relates to its original idea of *Place—Situation—State*, &c.

The Etymologists allow, that ITA belongs to Is, as *Outoos* does to *Outos*, (Ουτως, Ουτος); and thus we see, how in the phrase

ID

Id Est Ita, words, containing the same fundamental idea, perform different offices. This is precisely the same as *Statum Sistit* in *Statu*, or *Existens* res *Existit* in *Existentia*, except that this adjective and noun have not passed into Demonstrative parts of Speech. In Spanish, Este, Esta, Esto, mean *This;* and the above sentence might be expressed in Spanish by Esto Esta *en* Este *modo*, where we have precisely the same combination as in Id Est Ita. The Spanish Este, the Demonstrative part of Speech, which corresponds with *Iste*, and which we see directly attaches itself to Esta, signifying *Sistit*, *Stat*, *Locatur*, &c., will shew us how the Demonstrative part of Speech is connected with the idea of *Place*. If the sentence had been Id Est Ita, Ut *debet*, we see in Ut, the Conjunction, another mode of applying the same idea. Thus we perceive, that Ut, and its corresponding terms, belong to this race of words, and perform the same office of Marking or Demonstrating a certain *State* or *Position* of things. The English *That* is used likewise as a Conjunction precisely in the same manner, and the sentence might be '*That* 'thing Is Placed in *That* state, *That* it ought to be.' Let us suppose the sentence to have been 'Est' or '^St*at* Ad Januam,' which might have been, *Sistit Statione* Januæ: Hence we perceive, that Ad, and its parallel English term At, belong to this race of words, denoting *Station—Place*. This will be sufficient to be laid before the Reader at present, in order to understand the subject of Enquiry in this Section; and the extensive purposes to which this race of words now before us may be applied. We shall find, that the Elements ^M, ^B, ^F, ^P, ^V, and ^N, ^ND, ^NT, ^NG, &c., likewise denote *Being;* and that from these Elements, and our Element ^C, ^D, ^G, &c., have been derived the Auxiliary verbs, and the Pronouns, through a great variety of Languages. It will be found, moreover, that the inflexions of the other verbs in these Languages have arisen from the Auxiliary Verbs,

Verbs, or from the Pronouns; or, as it might be expressed, that the verbs in various Languages consist of a Radical part, expressing the sense of the verb, and of another part representing its inflexions, which are generally derived from the Auxiliary Verb, though sometimes perhaps from the Pronoun, corresponding with the Auxiliary. As it will be necessary for me, in the progress of my Enquiries, to combine the consideration of the words, which belong to the Elements ^M, ^B, &c., and ^N, ^ND, &c., with those, which belong to our Element ^C, ^D, ^G, &c., I shall first offer a few observations on these Elements ^M, ^B, &c., and ^N, ^ND, &c., in order to prepare the Reader for the due understanding of the following discussion.

The Element ^M, ^B, ^F, ^P, ^V, denotes Being through a wide extent of Human Speech. We shall not wonder at this fact, when we learn, that it supplies the name for *Father* and *Mother* through a great variety of Languages. Those, who have written on the theory of Languages, have collected these terms, which they have supposed to be derived from the first attempts of the Infant to utter sounds by means of the Lips—Pa-Pa, Ma-Ma, &c. &c. I shall not enter into the consideration of this theory at present; but I shall content myself with producing certain words, belonging to the Element ^M, ^B, &c., which denote *Father* and *Mother*—and other relations of Being. I shall compare different senses of these words, thus denoting Being, with some of the terms, to which they appear to belong; and we shall find, that they are connected with ideas attached to the *Ground*, just as we have seen in other instances, in which the Hypothesis, relating to the *Earth* or *Ground*, as the origin of words, has been maintained. Whatever may be the fact, as to the first origin of this race of words, if I may so express it, or of a certain portion of them; we shall find, that the name of the *Earth* or *Ground* is attached to the Element ^M^ in the most

marked

marked characters, and may be considered as predominating in the formation of words, which belong to it. I shall therefore still talk of the *Earth* or *Ground*, as affording the origin of this race of words, without meaning to reject a theory, which is indeed very plausible, and which might be admitted to a certain extent, without disturbing any of the main points of the argument, which I shall unfold in the succeeding discussion.

The word which signifies a *Mother* in Hebrew, אם AM, means, in its original sense, as Mr. Parkhurst imagines, "To "Support, Sustain, Confirm." It occurs not as a verb in this sense; but it means, as a Noun, "Posts, pillars, supporters;" and it likewise means, "A Mother, either," says Mr. Parkhurst, "from "*Supporting* the child in her womb, or afterwards in her arms." She is called *Mother*, as the *Chief—Main Support* of the Family, from which it arises, and on which it depends. The two succeeding senses of this word in Mr. Parkhurst's Lexicon are, "*A Metropolis*, or *Mother City.—The Mother of a way*, the place "where a way parts into several;" where the word is taken in its original sense of the *Chief Main* City, on which other cities depend, and the *Chief*—original Spot, from which other spots arise. We know, that *Father* and *Mother* are perpetually used in this metaphorical sense, which in some instances is in fact their original idea. R. Ainsworth explains *Pater* in one sense by the "Author, or *Founder* of a Sect;" where in the term *Founder* we have the original idea, which I conceive to be annexed to these words. We shall all acknowledge, that the names of *Father* and *Mother* would be naturally derived from the *Earth;* yet perhaps we should not agree on the precise notion, with which these terms were connected with that object. We should suppose, that they were derived from the *Earth*, as the great source of *Vegetable production*, as that which *Generates*, *Produces*, &c.; and when *Mother* is applied to the *Earth*, by Metaphor, from its signifi-

signification of the *Mother* of Animals, we perceive, that the word is obviously referred to this idea of *Generation* and *Production*:

"Common *Mother*, thou,
"Whose womb unmeasurable, and infinite breast,
"*Teems* and feeds all."

Here the idea of *Mother* is connected with the *Earth*, not only as the *Teeming* or *Producing* object, but as that, which Feeds, or Nourishes. In the Latin *Parens*, from *Pario*, we have the idea of *Producing*. Still however I must observe, that the name of *Father* and *Mother*, though taken perhaps directly from the *Earth*, is not always connected with this obvious and natural idea. Thus, in the present instance, the Hebrew AM אם denoting *Mother*, is taken from or is connected with the sense of the *Prop* or *Support*, and not from the notion of Generating or Producing.

In Arabic, the corresponding term AM ام has various senses, which are not derived from the idea of a Mother, but which belong to the original notion. Among other things it means "That in which any thing is contained, as a House, Habitation, "Sepulchre." Here we are brought at once to the *Ground*, the Spot, on which persons Dwell—Abide—Rest, &c. &c. The word likewise signifies, "The Root, origin, principle, the primary "cause upon which any thing depends;" where it means the *Base* or Foundation. The word is directly referred to its original Spot, when it is connected with دربن *Derin*, Withered. The terms ام دربن Ummi *Derin* signify, according to Mr. Richardson, "*Ground* without grass." In Greek, Amma, or Ammas, means a *Mother* and a Nurse, and likewise the Great Mother, *Magna Mater*, *Rhea*, the Goddess of the *Earth*, "Αμμα, ἡ τροφος και ἡ Μητηρ "κατα ὑποκορισμα, και ἡ Ῥεα· Λεγεται και Αμμας." The Hypothesis respecting the origin of this race of words, as it relates to the *Theory* of Languages, about which we have heard so much, is comprised within the most contracted limits, and may be at once explained and exhausted. We here see, that Amma, (Αμμα,) means

means both a *Mother* and the *Earth*, or the Goddess of the Earth. This union of ideas, which we should conceive to be most obvious and natural, we find here actually to exist; and we have only to decide, which of these two ideas, the *Mother* or the *Earth*, was the original one. If we should suppose, that the name for *Mother* was the original, and that it was derived from the first labial sounds of infants,—*AM-UM*—*AB-UB*, MA-MA, PA-PA, then the name of the *Earth* will be the secondary idea. To this Theory I have no objection. I have only to add, what is the great fundamental point in the question, that the name of this important object, AM, the *Earth*, when it was once formed, whatever might have been its source, would operate, as it does on other occasions, according to my hypothesis, and would supply the origin of the various words belonging to the Element; except those terms directly derived from the primitive idea. Such terms would be few in number; and therefore the Theory, which supposes that the names for Father and Mother, belonging to the Element ^M, ^B, &c., were derived from the labial sounds of Infants, will but little profit us, in discovering the origin of words belonging to this Element. It is the next step, which is the foundation of all our Etymological enquiries; and unless this be added, our Theory, however true it may be, is unavailing and useless. The term AMMAS, (Αμμας,) occurs in a well-known passage, preferred by Clemens Alexandrinus, which Bochart thus reads:

" ΑΜΜΑΣ

" Ιγνητων και Τελχινων εφυ ἡ ἀλυκη Ζαψ.

" Telchinum Ignetumque parens Zaps salsa creata est."

" Αμμας," says Bochart, " pro *Matre* deductum ex Syro אמא IMMA " vel EMMO, quomodo ex אבא ABBA Αππα pro Patre in Hymno " Callimachi in Dianam." (*Can.* lib. I. c. 7.)

In Arabic, بو ابو ابا اب AB, ABA, ABU, BU, signify *Father*.

In

In Hebrew אב AB signifies a *Father*. Mr. Parkhurst gives us, as another sense of this Hebrew word, "A first author, origin;" where we have the genuine idea. Mr. Parkhurst justly refers to this Hebrew word, "ABBOT, ABBESS, ABBEY." The Etymologists likewise see, that the Latin ABA, a term of respect from the younger to the Elder, belongs to the Eastern name of *Father;* and they produce likewise the phrase APPA *Pater*, (Αππα Πατερ.) They remind us likewise of APFA, or APFIA, (Απφα, Suid. Απφια, Hes. Frater vel Soror, velut à blandientibus sic appellantur,) a term of Endearment, with which Brothers and Sisters are addressed, where we have the *Being* of another sort. In Greek we have likewise APF*hus*, (Απφυς, Pater,) which belongs probably to the AB, Father, and not to *Phus*, (Φυς, à Φυω.) Perhaps the Radical of *Phuo*, (Φυω,) may appear in the present tense, and not in the future, *Phuso*, (Φυσω.) If the Radical appears in the future, it belongs to *Pater*. The Element ^B, ^F, &c. supplies the name for Father in the Polyglott Lord's Prayer in various Languages, as in the *Hebrew*, *Samaritan*, *Chaldee*, *Syriac*, *Æthiopic*, *Amharic*, *Arabic*, *Abyssinian*, &c. We shall now understand the origin of the Latin AB, and the Greek APO, (Απο,) denoting the *Source* or *Origin*, from which things arise, either as attached to the AB, denoting *Father*, or as belonging, without that intermediate step, to the Element ^B, ^P, signifying the *Earth*. To the Element ^M, ^V, &c., denoting the Venerable Female, or Male, we must refer the Latin AM*ita*, Av*ia*, Av-*us*, Av-*Unculus*, *At*-Av*us*, AB-Av-*us*, the Spanish AMO, Master and Mistress, &c. &c. Hence we have the word EAM, signifying Uncle, recorded by Skinner, with its parallel terms *Eame*, (Sax.) *Oom*, (Belg.) *Oheim*, *Ohm*, &c. (Germ.) Skinner likewise adds the German *Amme*, Nutrix. Some justly understand, that the Latin AMO belongs to the Eastern term for Mother, AM.—The Latin *Homo*, and its parallel terms, must be referred to this race of words. *Omnis* belongs to *Homo*.

The *n* in *Homin-is* and *Omn-is* is only an organical addition to the *m*.

I conceive, that the Element ^M, ^B, &c., as denoting the *Earth*, is connected with the Element *ch*-^M, as it appears in the Greek *ch*-AMAI, (Χαμαι.) The Etymologists understand, that *h*-UMI belongs to this Greek word; and we shall see from hence, how one form passes into the other. To *h*-UM-*us* belongs the English word *h*-OME, with its parallel terms in other Languages, as *Ham*, *Hæm*, (Sax.) Habitatio, Pagus, *Heym*, (Germ.) &c. To *Ham* we must refer, as the Etymologists acknowledge, the term HAM-*let*, and the addition to the names of Towns and Villages, as HAM-*ton*, *Notting*HAM, &c. &c., and the spot, near to which and at which I am writing these Discussions, as *Hing*-HAM, *Harding*-HAM, &c. &c. The English word AM, the verb of Being, is derived from the *h*-OME, *h*-AM, &c., the Dwelling-place—the certain Place or Spot, on which a Person is *Situated*—*Settled*, &c.; and thus 'To AM,' if I may so express it, or 'To Be,' means precisely the same as *Existere*, or *Sistere*, *Sisti*, To Be in a certain *Place*—*Station* or *Spot*—To be *Settled*—*Situated*, *Stationed*, *Placed*, &c. I use the verb in the Infinitive mood 'To AM,' in order to abstract the attention of the Reader from its familiar use, as a verb of Being, and to avoid repeating the word with that sense in my explanation, when it is used in the Present Tense.—We here see, that the verbs of Being, AM and Is, EST, ESTA, (Eng. Lat. and Span.) &c., belong, under different Elements, to the same metaphor of Being *Placed*, *Stationed*, *Situated*, &c. &c.

The Arabic word signifying Mother, ام AM, has precisely the same meaning, in one of its senses, as the English *h*-OME, and the Saxon *h*-AM, "Habitatio, Mansio;" as it denotes, according to Mr. Richardson's interpretation, "A House, Habi-"tation." Thus we see, that the Arabic AM, the Mother, and the English AM, To Be, convey similar ideas, *Sistor*, *Sisto*, quasi Funda-

Fundamentum, vel prima causa, or *Sistor*, *Sisto*, *Existo*, in certo loco, quasi Fundamento, *Sum*. The Greek *Up-Archo*, from *Arche*, the Base, the Foundation, or Fixed Spot, on which any thing is *Situated*, *Settled*, *Founded*, &c., (Υπαρχω, Initium do,—*Sum*, *Existo*, Αρχη, Principium, Exordium, Initium, *Fundamentum*,) will at once express the sense of AM, the Mother, and AM, the term of Being, as connected with the *Foundation*, or *Fixed Spot*. Let us mark the preposition UPO, (Υπο, Sub,) which we shall now understand to belong to our Element ^B, ^P, &c., denoting the Base, as we have seen in AB, (Lat.) APO, (Απο,) &c. In UPer, (Υπερ, Super,) as likewise in the English Over, UP, we have the idea of the same Spot—the Surface of the Earth, as denoting the *Top*. The notion annexed to the *Top* and *Bottom*, as the Extreme part of any thing, is only a different mode of conceiving the same object. We see, how the Elementary forms *s*-P and ^P are connected in UPO, UPER, (Υπο, Υπερ,) and *s*-UB, *s*-UPER, as I have supposed.

We shall now understand, that the term HAVE, under the form of the Element ^B, ^V, &c., belongs to *h*-OME, *h*-AM, AM, &c., and signifies the *Possession* of a certain Spot—Place, &c. The parallel term in Latin, HABeo, actually signifies, as R. Ainsworth explains it, "To Dwell, or Continue in a place;" from whence, we know, comes *Habito*, with its parallel terms *Habitation*, &c.; and in another sense HABeo signifies, as the same Lexicographer interprets it, "To be in a State, To go, Stand, or be affected," (*Habere* bene, Præclare—Male, &c.); where HAB-*eo* and AM have precisely the same sense. We observe, that in the above interpretation, the words *State* and *Stand*, "To be in a *State*, To *Stand*," present to us the very metaphor, from which the term is derived; namely, that of a *Stand* or a *Place*, to '*Dwell*' *and* '*Continue* in.' We perceive too, in the same interpretation, the term *Be*, "To *Be*," which, we know, is the verb of Existence. Let us mark the

the term *Be*, which belongs to this race of words; when the breathing before the Radical Consonant is lost, as B^, &c. The parallel terms to *Have*, are *Habban*, (Sax.) *Haban*, (Goth.) *Haben*, (Germ.) *Avoir*, *Avere*, *Aver*, (Fr. Ital. Span.) *Hebben*, (Belg.) *Haffue*, (Dan.) *Habeo*, *Abeis*, (Gr. Αβεις, εχεις,) &c. &c.—Under the form ^F, ^V, &c., we find a similar race of words relating to the *Place of Abode*, as under the form ^M. In Scotch, Hoif, Hoff, Hove, Houff, Hufe, signify 'A *Hall*—A *Burial* Place,' or the Spot, in which a Person is *Settled*—*Situated*—*Abides*, &c. &c. Dr. Jamieson produces this word Hoif, &c. in his Scottish Dictionary, and justly refers it to the Saxon *Hofe*, Domus, Spelunca, *Hof*, (Germ.) A House, and in Barbarous Latin, "*Hob-a*, *Hov-a*, *Hov-ia*, Villa, "Prædium." Wachter derives the term as used in this sense from A. S. *Hiw-an*, "formare, fabricare." Our familiar word Ho*vel*, we see, belongs to the above terms. Haft means likewise, in the Scotch Language, "Dwelling, Place of Residence."

The Greek Echo, (Εχω,) has exactly the same relation to Esti, (Εστι,) Est, (Lat.) Ez-*omai*, (Εζομαι,) which *Have* bears to *Am*. The term *Have* is used, we know, to denote the past tense of verbs, as I *Have* Loved; and so is the verb of Existence used, as Io *Sono* stato, I *Am* been, that is, I *Have* been, Je *suis* Venu, I *Am* Come, or I *Have* Come, where *Am* and *Have* are both used. The Greek Echo, (Εχω,) is used to denote a past tense, as the English *Have*, &c. is, as Μαθων Εχω, Ποιησας Εχω, for Εμαθον, Εποιησα, I *Have* learned, I *Have* Done, &c. In such phrases as "Vinculis illum "constrictum Habeo," Αυτον εχω δησας, 'I *Have* him, (that is, 'I Hold him) bound, I *Have* bound him;' we see, how the verb of Possession slides into the signification of a *Past* Tense. The ideas annexed to Am and Have are inseparable from each other, both in their original sense, and in some of the various modes, in which they are applied.—In my observations therefore on the Element ^M, ^B, &c., I shall not always stop to enquire whether that part of

of verbs, in which the Element ^M, ^P, is found, belongs to what we distinguish by the name of the verb of Being, or the verb of Possession, to AM or to HAVE. In French, as we know, the verb of Possession is oftentimes best translated by the verb of Being, as Il y *a*, There *Is*, There *Are*, It *Is;* Il y *Avoit*, There *Was*, There *Were*. In Spanish the Grammarians justly translate the tenses of the verb of Possession used impersonally, *Hay*, *Havia*, &c., by There *Is*, There *Was*, *Were*, &c. The writer of the Grammar, now before me, explains *Haver*, as an Impersonal, by "To *Be* in "what concerns a *Place*." On other occasions in Spanish the use of the verb of Possession coincides with the sense of the verb of Being in other Languages, as '*Havia* de dar' is translated by I *Was* to give, or, as we might say, 'I *Had* to Give;' and in French, 'J'*Aie* à Etudier' is translated by 'I *Am* to study,' which might be rendered, 'I *Have* to study.' I must again repeat, that HAVE and AM should be considered only as different forms of each other, conveying the same idea of *Place—Situation*, &c.; and they differ in nothing but in this respect, that HAVE is commonly used as a transitive verb, as the Grammarians would call it, and AM, as a Neuter or Passive, I HAVE, AM. Yet this minute difference of application perpetually disappears. The Latin *Habeo*, as we have seen, like the parallel word in modern Languages, passes into a neuter sense, and means AM or Be—"To *Be* in a state or con-"dition," &c.—'*Habere*, male'—To *Be* Badly. We know too, that the Greek Εχω, *Habeo*, passes likewise into the neuter sense, ("Adfectus *Sum*,") and signifies I AM, Ευνοικως Εχω, I HAVE or AM benevolently, i. e. I AM disposed benevolently, &c. The forms of ^M and ^B, ^V, ^F, &c., are sometimes applied indifferently in the transitive and the neuter or passive senses. In the Welsh and Armoric, we find the verb of Being, or the verb with a Neuter or Passive sense, under the form ^F, ^V, as WYF, OV, I *Am;* and in Russian, the transitive sense appears under the form

form ^M, as Imeio, I *Have*.—In the Hindostan Dialect, Hoova means I Am. In Scotch, as we have seen, Hoif, Hoff, &c. means the *Hall*, the place in which a Person is *Situated—Settled*, &c., and Haft, "Dwelling, Place of Residence;" and we find likewise two verbs, belonging to these words, one of which is used as an active verb, and the other as a neuter. Haif and Have signify To *Have;* and Hove, Hufe, Huff, signify "To "Lodge, to Remain," as Dr. Jamieson explains it, where we see the neuter sense of Am.

The Element ^N, ^NC, ^ND, ^NS, ^NT, &c. &c. denotes *Being—The Man—The Powerful—Illustrious* Man, &c., and is employed to express *Pronouns*—verbs of Being, &c. &c., through the whole compass of Language. I do not attempt to decide on the original idea annexed to these words. I shew in another part of this work, that the Element ^N, ^NC, &c. affords a great race of words, which signify 'To Hold, Gripe, Grasp,' &c., as *Hand, Hank, Hang*, &c., *Uncus, Unguis, Onux*, (Ονυξ,) &c.; and we know, that some of the terms must appear in Greek, under the form of our Element ^GG, ^GC, &c., as *Agcho*, (Αγχω, Constringo,) &c., which will shew us, how the forms might pass into each other, and how the races of words under both these forms might be related. I will not attempt to decide, whether this relation takes place; and I must observe, moreover, that the terms, under the form ^N, ^NG, &c., whatever might be its origin, would constitute, when it once existed, a distinct race of words, with a turn of meaning peculiar to itself. To the Element ^N, as denoting *Man—The Distinguished Being*, &c., we must refer the Greek An-*er*, And-*r-os*, (Ανηρ, Ανδρος,) Anth-*r-op-os*, (Ανθρωπος, Homo,) Ana, Anax, Anakt, (Ανα, O rex, Αναξ, Ανακτος, Rex, η Regina, Herus, Dominus.) The Anax is nothing but *The Man*—The Anax Andron, (Αναξ Ανδρων,) The Distinguished Man among Men. The X and KT, in Anax and Anakt, seem to be only organical additions

additions to the *N*, as the *D* and *T* in ANDros and ANThropos. If the name of Man should be derived from the idea of the *Seizer*—the *Griper*—the *Strong* Being; then the form and idea of ANAKS, (Αναξ,) would coincide with ONUX, (Ονυξ,) and AND—ANT in ANDros, ANThropos, (Ανδρος, Ανθρωπος,) with HAND, &c. The *Er* in *An-Er* belongs to the Element ^R, denoting Being; and it is retained, we see, in *And-*^R*-os*.—The *Anthr*, in *Anthr-op-os*, should be considered as belonging to *Aner*, and the OP should be referred to the Element ^P, denoting Being. I shall shew, in another Volume, that the Element ^RM or ^RP denotes *Man* likewise; and the only difficulty is to decide, whether *Rop* may not be the second part of the compound, instead of *Op*. The same difficulty occurs in *Merops*, *Merop-os*, (Μεροψ, Divisam vocem habens, Μεροπες, Hominum Epith. Homines,) which has nothing to do with *Meiro*, (Μειρω, Divido,) To Divide, and *Ops*, (Οψ,) the Voice; but it is a compound of MR, denoting Man, and RP, or ^P, bearing a similar meaning. The Latin *Homo*, as we have seen, is attached to the Element ^M, ^P, &c. In English we have *Hine*, *Hind*, which belongs to ANer, (Ανηρ.) In Hebrew אנש *ANS* signifies Man, and so it does in Chaldee and Syriac. In Arabic, انس *Ans* or *Ins* signifies Mankind, and انسان *Insan* means likewise "Man and Mankind." In the English AUNT and UNC-*le*, we see the Element ^NC, ^NT, &c. denoting Being. The UNCUL-*us* in *Av*-UNCUL-*us*, belongs to UNCLE. In Syriac, ANTTA signifies a Woman; and in Arabic, انثا ANSA or UNSA is a Woman, Female. In Irish, AINDEAR is a Young Woman. (See Lhuyd sub voce *Mulier*, and Vallancey's Gramm. p. 67. Ed. 2.) The Latin ENS was adopted from the Greek *Oon*—*On*, *Ont*-os, &c. (Ων, ουσα, Ον, Οντος, &c.) I have given some of the more general terms, denoting Being, under the Element ^N, &c.; but the Pronouns—Verbs—Participles, belonging to it, will be noted in the progress of these Enquiries.

Before I proceed to the investigation of the terms expressing *Being*,

Being, under our Element ^C, ^D, &c., I must beseech the Reader diligently to observe, that the origin, from which the races of words denoting *Being*, under these different Elements, are supposed to be derived, is totally unconnected with the truth of the discussion, which is employed in unfolding the existence of such terms, and in detailing their relation to each other. If, for example, the Reader should not imagine, that the race of words, denoting Being, under our Element ^C, ^D, &c., belongs to the EARTH; the facts which I detail, respecting the existence of these words, and of their affinity with each other, remain precisely the same. The Reader may either suppose, that the evidence, which I have given for their connection with the EARTH, EST*ia*, &c. &c. (Εστια,) &c. is not sufficiently strong and convincing; or he may think, that the nature of the question will not admit of any proof, sufficient to establish a position of this kind. In other races of words, we are almost perpetually able to discover some peculiar vein of meaning in the terms examined, which present to us the original idea, and lead us to the primitive spot, from whence they were derived. But in this race of words we can expect only to see the bond of union, between the primary and the secondary idea, preserved in a few terms; and thus the evidence of their origin, whatever it may have been, will of necessity be obscure and imperfect. When the idea of *This* or *That* Existing *Being* was once attached to certain terms, they would propagate a race of words belonging to each other, in which only the secondary sense of *This* or *That* Being would appear, while the primary idea of *Existence*, as belonging to *Place*—to *Sisto*, &c., if such should have been the origin, would be entirely lost. The writer is aware of these difficulties; and he has only to observe, that he has endeavoured to perform all which the case would admit. It became his duty, in the progress of his work, to unfold the relation of certain terms to each other, which denote Being, under the Element

Element ^C, ^D, &c.; and this part has been accomplished, I trust, to the satisfaction of the enquiring Philologist, in a series of numerous and striking facts, which were before altogether hidden and unknown. As these words for Being or Existence must be derived from some primary idea, I have suggested, in the commencement of my enquiry, that the original notion was probably that of *Place*, which directly connects it with the *Ground*, or EARTH. I have shewn, what every one must acknowledge, that this union of ideas between *Place* and *Being* actually occurs in the very word *Existence*, and in other terms belonging to our Element ^C, ^D, &c. All this is plain and probable; yet I am still aware, that the primary idea, whatever it may be, can be recalled to our view in a few examples only; and that the spirit of the discussion consists in discovering the relation of the terms to each other, when they are used in their familiar secondary sense of *This* or *That* Being, Thing, &c. I shall therefore direct my attention to the detail of these facts, which exhibit this secondary idea, and which I regard as the essential part of the discussion; though I shall not fail to introduce any proofs, presenting themselves in the course of my enquiry, which I may conceive to be illustrative of the primary idea supposed in my hypothesis.

^C, ^D, ^G, &c.

Verbs denoting *Existence*, or Verbs of Being, derived from the idea of that, which is *Placed—Set—Situated—Stands up*, &c.

Ist-*amai*. (Gr.) I am *Placed, Situated, I Stand up*, &c. I am.

Est-*ar*. (Span.) To be in a *Place*, To Be, as an auxiliary verb.

^St-*are*. (Ital.) To Stand, To Be.

Est, Esti, Es, Ess-*er*, Is, Ist, Ast, Este, &c. (Lat. and Fr. Gr. Span. Saxon and Belg. Goth. and Germ. Pers. Russ. &c.) —

Is. (Eng.) Or To Be.

ISH. (Heb.) *Existence, Substance*, Reality.

IS. (Heb.) *Is*, Are, Was, Were.

AIS—AIS*h*. (Heb.) A Being or thing *Subsisting* or *Existing*, Man, Woman, Each, any one.

ATA, ^Ta, As, Is. (Irish.) *Is*.

Ata—^Ta—Is. (Gal.) *Is*.

Oes, Si. (Welsh.) *Is*.

Ez, Ysy, Otte, Ydzhi. (Corn.) *Is*.

Ez=*Eo*, So. (Armor.) *Is*.

So, Se. (Anc. Ital.) I am, thou art.

Se. (Gipsey.) *Is*.

Si. (Sax.) I am, thou art, he is.

^S=*Um*, ES-*Um*. (Lat.) I am.

ES=*Me*, Hst=*M*. (Russ. & Pers.)

Ata=*Im*, ^Ta=*Im*, ^TS=*Aim*, ^S=*Am*, ^S=*Om*. (Irish.) I Am.

I shall now return to the consideration of our Element ^C, ^D, ^G, ^J, ^K, ^Q, ^S, ^X, ^Z, as it relates to *Being*, &c.; and first I shall consider the verb of *Being*, Est, Is, &c., which I have supposed to belong to such terms as Ez*omai*, Ist-*emi*, (Εζομαι, Sedeo, Ιστημι, Statuo,) and to convey precisely the same idea, as that annexed to the term *Exist*, which means, Quod *Sistit*, or *Sistitur*, What is *Placed—Situated*, &c. &c. The verb of Being, Is, and its parallels, are found in a great variety of Languages; as

as in the Latin, Greek, Italian, Spanish, French; the Dialects of the Teutonic and Sclavonic, in Persian, Hebrew, and in the Celtic and Hindostan Dialects. In Latin, the Element ^S, &c. appears in Es, Est, Est*is*, Ess*em*, Ess*e*. In the Laws of the Twelve Tables, Eso is written for *Ero;* and this might lead us to conclude, that *Eram* was quasi Es*am*. In Greek we have Eis, Esti, Est-*on*, Est-*on*, Es*men*, Este, Eisi, (Ειμι, εις, vel ει, εστι, εστον, εστον, εσμεν, εστε, εισι,) Es *omai*, &c.—Isthi, Eso, Este, &c. (Εσομαι, &c. Ισθι, vel εσο, εστω, &c.) In Italian we have Ess*ere*, &c.; and in the Participle, we have *Stato*, which is acknowledged to belong to the idea of *Place* or *Position*. In Spanish, as I have observed, we have Est*ar*, To be, which is acknowledged likewise to be derived from the idea of *Position;* and there is another verb, *Ser*, To be, *Soi*, I am, the second and third persons of which are *Eres*, and *Es*. In the third person of the Italian, *E*, He Is, the *S* is lost; though it is preserved, as we see, in the Spanish Es. In French we have Estre or Etre, Es, Est, Et*es*, Et*ois*, &c.—Eté, &c. Some of the French Etymologists tell us, that this verb of Being, with its various tenses, derives its origin from three different sources, as *Suis* from *Sum*—*Fus* from *Fui*, and *Etre* from *Stare*. They inform us, moreover, that *Stare* was used for *Etre*, as in Horace:

"Hoc miseræ plebi *Stabat* commune sepulcrum."

They add likewise, that in the ancient French writers, Estre is used for *Stare*, as in Froissard Estant *sur ses pieds*. An adjacent word to this in the Dictionary of Menage, is Etree or Est*ree*, *Chemin*, A Road, Path; which we see at once brings us to the *Ground*—the Spot, from which I suppose the term under a similar form, Etre, to be taken.

The Etymologists have produced the parallel terms to the English Is, as the Saxon and Belgic Is, the Gothic and German Ist, the Greek Esti, (Εστι,) and the Latin Est. In the Russian Dialect

Dialect of the Sclavonic, we have Es*me*, Ese, Este, for *Sum*, Es, Est; where in Esme we see the true form of the Latin *Esum*. In Persian, *Am*, *Ai*, Ast, *Em*, or *Aim*, Ed, or Aid,—*And*, ام &c. mean 'I am, Thou art,' &c. and هستن Hast*an* or Hst*n* signifies To Be. The present tense of this verb is a compound of *Am* and Hst, Hst=^M, I am, where there is the same compound, which I have supposed to exist in Es-*Um*.

There is some difficulty, which on the first view presents itself, on deciding on the Auxiliary verb *Sum*, and its parallels under that form. We all agree, I imagine, that S=*Um* and *Am* belong to each other; and they might be connected by supposing the loss or the addition of the *s* in the forms of the Element S=M, ^M, or *s*=^M. In this case the *s* would not be significant. We see, however, in the ancient Latin word Es=*Um*, that the ES appears to be a separate and significant portion, belonging to ^S, Est, &c.; and this is confirmed by observing the same form in the Sclavonic Es=*Me*—the Greek Es=*Men*, (Εσμεν,) and the law of formation in the Persian Hst=*M*, which is unequivocally Hst, or Est, the verb of Being, belonging to the Element ^S, and ^M, or Am. This Persian form I imagine to represent precisely the law of formation in the Latin ES-*Um*, or ^S-*Um;* and we shall perceive, in the progress of our Enquiries, that every thing confirms this idea. Thus then ^S=*Um*, Es, Est, S=*Umus*, Est*is*, ^S=*Unt*, are quasi ES=*Um*, Es, Est, ES=*Umus*, Est*is*, ^S=*Unt;* and hence we see, that the Auxiliary verb is made up of three different Elements, or of three different forms of Auxiliary verbs, as ^S, ^M, ^N; and we shall find, that these Elements, with the addition of the Element ^R, compose the inflexions of the Auxiliary and other verbs in a great variety of Languages, together with the Pronouns, &c. &c. The Element ^R should probably be considered, as belonging to the ^S. We have seen, that *Ero* was originally Eso, and in ancient Language the S frequently

frequently appears, where R is now written, as *Asa*, *Honos*, for *Ara*, *Honor*. We see the form of the Auxiliary verb, as belonging to the Element ^M, distinct in the English AM, the Gothic IM or AM, the Saxon EOM, the Persian AM ام and the Greek EIMI, (Ειμι,) &c., unless we should imagine, as I have sometimes thought, that the Greek *Eimi*, (Ειμι,) was originally EJ-*Mi*, as in ES-*Um;* yet in the Æolic *Emi*, and the Doric *Emmi*, (Ημι, Æol. Εμμι, Dor.) we see nothing of this form. In Hebrew, ישה ISH denotes, says Mr. Parkhurst, *Existence*, *Substance*, *Reality*, as the general idea; and in the first sense, יש IS means, as he says, "Is, *Are*, *Was*, *Were*." This word contains every thing to illustrate my Hypothesis. Mr. Parkhurst, we perceive, not only explains it by *Existence*, but by *Subsistence;* where we see the more original idea, connected likewise with the same metaphor of *Sisto*. This Hebrew word affords the appropriate terms, perpetually recurring in that Language, for *Man* and *Woman*, or *Being* in general. "As a N." says Mr. Parkhurst, "with a formative א, "איש fem. אשה dropping the '," A, AIS—ASH—I, "A Being, or "thing, *Subsisting* or *Existing*.—"It may be and frequently is ren- "dered, *Each*, *Every one*." This is precisely the idea, which I have annexed to the origin of HIC, IS, ISTE, (Lat.) &c. &c. Mr. Parkhurst refers to this word, Is, YES, (Eng.) in which he is right, and likewise *Ice*, which is considered on another occasion. The connection of this Hebrew word with other terms in that Language will be particularly examined in a future page.

In detailing all that can be known respecting the formation of verbs, we must proceed with caution in the enquiry; and in analysing their different parts, we must endeavour to discover the office performed by these parts, and to trace their progress from the most simple state to the more complicated forms. We are not to expect, that we can determine with precision on all occasions the original meaning of each part, or that any system can be adopted,

adopted, which will explain all the varieties of their formation. I mean only to observe some general facts respecting their construction, which have not been sufficiently understood, and which will exhibit to us, in the strongest point of view, how intimately the different kinds of Human Speech are connected with each other in their essential and fundamental properties. I mean to shew, that the Verbs in various Languages, where different inflexions are used to mark different tenses, may be considered as compounds; one part of which is the Radical expressing the action of the verb, and the other part, constituting the inflexion, is derived from the Auxiliary verb of Being, and performs the same office as that verb. Thus various Languages, with verbs having inflexions, as the *Latin*, *Greek*, &c., are founded on the same principles as our own; the great business of which is performed by Auxiliary verbs, and the word expressing the action of the verb; except that in one case the Auxiliary verb has been joined with that word, and in the other it is separate. This idea is obvious, and has accordingly been adopted; yet our enquirers have seen nothing of the extent or the genuine principles of the process, by which this formation has been effected; and the present observations may be considered, as supplying the curiosity of the Reader, with a new theme of meditation, on the constitution of Languages. The first object to which we should direct our attention is the Auxiliary, and this should be examined with great care and diligence. The Auxiliary verb itself is subject to inflexions, and therefore we may sometimes expect to find a composition, of a kind similar to that, which takes place in ordinary verbs; namely, of one part expressing the action of the verb, and the inflexion or the verb of Being in a simpler state. This composition will only differ from that in ordinary verbs by the union of two parts, expressing the same idea of Being, either under the same or different Elements. Nay, even this inflexion itself,

or

or the verb of Being in its more simple state, may still be a compound, formed of the same or similar materials, which may likewise be separated from each other. I have endeavoured to speak as distinctly as I can on this subject, and to proceed with the analysis as far as I am able, without losingmy own meaning in the minuteness of the enquiry. All this, I trust, will be sufficiently intelligible, when it is illustrated by the example before us, *Sum*, Es-*Um*, &c. &c.

On a former occasion I made some enquiries into the composition of verbs, in which many facts were disclosed, before little understood; and in which the general principles of the question may be regarded as justly established, though they were not so fully unfolded, under such various points of view, as the nature of the subject may perhaps seem to demand. I have there supposed, with some others, that the inflexions of verbs were originally Pronouns; and when in the present discussion I consider them as verbs, still the same fundamental idea is preserved; and in many cases it is impossible to discover, to which of these parts of Speech the addition of Inflexion should be ascribed, or rather it is idle to attempt a distinction between the two. I shew, that the Pronouns and the Verbs belong to the same Elements, and are only different forms of each other, discharging different offices. Now this difference of office can hardly be said to exist, before Languages have assumed a regular form; and therefore it would be idle in some cases to attempt a distinction of this nature; when we refer to these simple and original forms, from which the composition of Languages has arisen. I must observe moreover, that the arrangement of such Grammatical distinctions does not fall within the province of my Enquiries, which relates only to Elementary forms and Elementary meanings. It is my business to discover the Elementary character and idea, as abstracted from the various modifications of meaning and office, into which

which they may pass in the formation of words.—When that has been duly performed, the duties of my office terminate. Still, however, I have thought it expedient on some occasions to attempt these Grammatical distinctions, and to adopt that phraseology which is familiar to other Philologists. We may observe indeed, that in some cases those distinctions, when strongly marked, may be considered as important points in the nature of the discussion.—We shall find, that some Languages are even distinguished from others by this circumstance, that the addition or Inflexion to the verb has been directly taken from that part of Speech, called by all Grammarians the Pronoun. If it should likewise appear, from evidence sufficiently distinct, that in some other Languages the Inflexion of the ordinary verbs is derived from that part of Speech, which Grammarians would agree to denominate the Verb of Being, this distinction is important to be exhibited; as from such facts we obtain a strong characteristic difference between those Languages, in which they are found to exist.

Let us again place before us the present tense of the Latin verb of Being, ^S-^UM, ES, EST, ^S-UMUS, ESTIS, ^S-UNT; and let us take the first state of the composition in this word. In examining the ordinary verbs, and the verb of Being itself, in other tenses, we shall at once see, that a law of Inflexion exists, which must be referred to UM, ES, EST, UMUS, ESTIS, UNT; or to the Elements ^M for the first person; ^S, ^T, &c. for the second and third singular; ^M joined with ^S, &c. for the first plural; ^S, ^T, &c. joined to itself for the second plural; and ^N, ^NT, &c. for the third. Thus in *Leg*=AM, *Leg*=AS, *At*, *Leg*=AMUS, *Leg*=ATIS, *Leg*=ANT, we unequivocally see, that AM, AS, AT, AMUS, ATIS, ANT, are additions to the part *Leg*, which represents the action of the verb; and that they correspond with UM, ES, EST, UMUS, ESTIS, UNT. Now this would be enough to convince us, that the

Auxiliary

Auxiliary, as it appears in S=UM, S=UMUS, S=UNT, and in S=IM, S=IS, S=IT, S=IMUS, S=ITIS, S=INT, was a compound, in which S was a separate part; and that UM, ES, EST, UMUS, ESTIS, UNT, IM, IS, IT, IMUS, ITIS, INT, represented in fact the simpler form of the Auxiliary Verb. But we have seen in Persian, that the present tense of the Auxiliary is AM, AI, (which I conceive to be quasi AJ, corresponding with Es, Lat. EIS, Εἰς, &c.) AST, AIM, AID, AND, I AM, Thou ART, He Is, We, Ye, They are; and we now perceive, that this form coincides with UM, ES, EST, UM, EST, UNT, of the Latin UM, ES, EST, UM-*Us*, EST-*Is*, UNT.

Thus then we understand, that UM, ES, EST, UM, EST, UNT, is the simplest and first state of the Latin Auxiliary, and that the UM=*Us* and EST=*Is* are compounds. We may represent therefore the simplest state by ^M, ^S, &c., ^S, &c., ^M, ^S, &c. ^N, ^NT, &c. Now I conceive, that the ^S or Es, as we see it in Es=*Um*, denotes Being, and bears precisely the same relation to the *Um*, which *Leg* does to *Am* in *Leg=Am;* and that the one denotes 'I *Am=Being*' as the other does 'I *Am=Reading*.' They differ only in the circumstance of the Verb of Being being added to another term, expressing Being, either under different or the same Elements; as ^*S=Um* or Es=*Um*, and EST=*Is*. We see, that in the present tense of the Auxiliary, as it is now written, the composition of ^S and the Auxiliary only appears in the first persons singular and plural, ^*S=Um*, ^*S=Umus;* and we see moreover, that the vowel breathing before the S is lost. But in another tense we have the vowel breathing before the ^S, as in Ess=*Em;* and we find moreover, that the composition of Ess with the auxiliary EM, ES, ET, EMUS, ETIS, ENT, remains through all the persons; as Ess=EM, Ess=ES, Ess=ET, Ess=EMUS, Ess=ETIS, Ess=ENT. We here see the auxiliary *Em, Es, Est, Emus, Etis, Ent*, similar to the form *Um, Es, Est, Umus, Estis, Unt*. Again, in the imperfect

 Er-Am,

Er-Am, we have the *Er* prefixed to the Auxiliary *Am*, *As*, *At*, *Amus*, *Atis*, *Ant*.

The Ess in Ess-*Em* is plainly the part denoting Being, and it coincides in form with Ess-*e*. The *Er* in *Er=Am* is probably quasi Es=*Am*, as the *Ero* is acknowledged to have been anciently written Eso. Thus, then, as *S=Um* is *Es=Um*, and *Ero*, *Eso*, if *Er=Am*, *S=Im*, *S=Umus*, and *S=Unt*, are quasi *Es=Am*, and *Es=Im*, *Es-Umus*, *Es-Unt*, we shall have all the tenses regularly compound of Es and the Auxiliary *Am*, &c., except that the *Am* does not appear in the first person of the future *Ero* or *Eso*, nor the composition of Es in some persons of the present. Vossius, however, has given us an ancient form for the present tense, in which the composition of ^S with the Auxiliary appears in all the persons, as Es=*Um*, Es=*Is*, Ess=*It*, Es=*Umus*, Es=*Itis*, Es=*Unt*; where we see the Es or Ess is annexed to the Auxiliary *Um*, *Is*, *It*, *Umus*, *Itis*, *Unt*. We shall see, in the course of our Enquiries, a similar kind of composition; and the Persian verb هستن Hstn, or Hastan, To be, exhibits an acknowledged union of this species. The present tense of this verb is Hst=M, Hst=Y, Hst, Hst=*Im*, Hst-*Yd*, Hst=*Nd*, which is acknowledged to be, as all verbs are in Persian, a composition of the part expressing the sense of the Verb and the Auxiliary. The third person singular, *Hyst*, may either be considered as a compound, or as existing in its simple state. The composition of the Latin Es=Um, in the Plural Es=Um-*Us*, is, according to the analogy here exhibited, Hst=Im; but the office which *Us* performed is not quite apparent. It was added probably to distinguish it from Es=*Um* in the singular, and the *Us* might denote Being, as the *ES* does at the beginning. If that should have been the fact, the addition of *Us* is contrary to the analogy of *Es*, by being put after instead of before the verb of Being. In Est=*Is*, if we have the same union, as in Hst=*Yd*, the Est represents

represents the HYST, denoting Being, and the *Is* is the verb of Being. Perhaps, however, the first part, *Est*, originally expressed the verb of Being, and *Is* is an addition after it, as the *Us* undoubtedly is in the word *Es=Um=Us*. The Preterite *Fui* belongs to the Element ^F, or F^, denoting Being. In the other parts of the tense we have *Fu=Isti*, *Fu=It*, &c., where, in the ISTI, IT, IMUS, ISTIS, UNT, we have the same form which I have now exhibited.—The *Er*, we know, is inserted before the *Unt*, as *Er-Unt*, Fu=*Erunt;* and *Ere* appears by itself, *Fu-Ere*, where in the first we have the same combination as in the *Erunt* of the Future; and in the second the *Ere* is the simpler form, as in the Latin *Ero*, and the Italian *Ero*, *Eri*, *Era*, I was, &c. In the *Fu=Eram*, *Fu=Erim*, *Fu=Ero*, *Fu=Issem*, we have compounds of *Fu*, and *Eram*, *Ero*, and *Essem*.

In the other Latin verbs, we plainly see, as I before suggested, that they are compounds of the part, which expresses the idea, conveyed by the Verb, and of the Auxiliary Verb. As *Am*=AS, *Am*-AT, &c. *Mon*=ES, *Mon*=ET, &c. are compounds of *Am*, and *Mon*, signifying to 'Love' and 'Advise,' and of AS, AT, AMUS, ATIS, ANT, ES, ET, EMUS, ETIS, ENT, which express the Auxiliary verb ES, EST, UMUS, ESTIS, UNT. The ^M, or AM, we see, does not appear in the first person of the present tense, but it does in most of the other tenses of the active voice, as *Legeb*=AM, *Leg*=AM, *Leger*=EM, &c. &c.; and thus we have in *Leg*=AM, *Leg*=AS, &c. the AM, AS, AT, AMUS, ATIS, ANT, for the Auxiliary UM, ES, &c. added to *Leg*, denoting the action of the verb. The addition of ^M and ^M=^S, without the preceding ^S, to *Leg*, *Mon*, &c., expressing the action of the verb in the first persons singular and plural, *Leg*=AM, *Leg*=AMUS, *Mon*=EAM, *Mon*=EAMUS, is alone sufficient to convince us, that the S in *S*=UM and *S*=UMUS was originally a part distinct by itself. If *Sum*, *Sumus* had been always united, representing the genuine state of the verb of Being, we should have

have had *Leg*=*Sam*, *Leg*=*Samus*, *Mon*=*Seam*, *Mon*=*Seamus*, &c. &c., or something of that sort. In the Imperfect tense, ^*Am*=*Ab*=Am, *Mon*=*Eb*=Am, &c., we have the Am at the end of the word, bearing the same sense as the English Am; but we have likewise, as we see, the AB, and EB, belonging to the same Element. The office, which AB and EB originally performed, precisely corresponded with that of *h*-Ave. It was applied to mark the *past time;* 'I *h*=Ave Loved, Advised,' &c. The Ab and Eb in the Imperfect tense will bear the same meaning, as the Av, Iv, U-*i*, quasi ^V-*i*, do in *Am*=Av-*i*, *Aud*=Iv-*i*, *Mon*=U-*i* or *Mon*=^V-*i*. It has been conjectured by others, that the Av in the Latin *Am*=Av-*i* corresponded with the English Have, as it might be in the phrase '*Lov'd*=Have *I.*' The Av precisely agrees in sense with Have, if my conjecture should be right. We have the AB and EB again in the Future *Am*=AB-*o*, *Mon*=EB-*o*. Here again the AB and EB must belong to Have or Am, whatever might be the precise office which they performed. They might have been merely terminations, as the *Am* at the end of the word *Am*=*AB*=Am, *Mon*-*EB*-Am; and in that case, there would be no significant portions in this Future tense to express the time of the Future; or they might have been significant terminations for Have or Am to express a Future time, as we use these words in the phrases 'I Am to do a thing,' or 'I Have to do a thing;' so that *Am*=AB-*o*, *Mon*=EB-*o*, would have signified 'I Have to Love, Advise,' &c.

In the Spanish Language the use of Haver is very various, and it is particularly applied to express a Future action; 'Haver 'de Dar, To give hereafter,' '*He* de Dar, I *will* give.' My Grammarian has four Future tenses, in three of which the verb Haver is used,—"Yo Dare, I *shall* or *will* give"—"He de dar, I *will* give "or must give"—"Yo Havia de dar, I *shall* be obliged to give"—"Yo Havia de dar, I was to give." In *Leg*, *Audi*}*Am* of the future, the *Am* seems to be only a termination, as in other tenses.

The

The formation of the Spanish verb *Estar*, To Stand, or To Be, which we may consider altogether to coincide with the Latin ^*Stare*, will fully illustrate and confirm my hypothesis, respecting the mode in which the Latin verbs have been generated.—First I may note, that the verb *Haver* in Spanish assumes, in some tenses, the ^B of HABEO, as well as the ^V, as HUB*ieramos*; and thus in Italian we have Av*ere*, and ABBIA. The Preterimperfect, the first Preterperfect, and the second and third Preterperfect, and the Preterpluperfect, as they are called by the Spanish Grammarians, are respectively under the following forms; *Est*=ABA, I was, *Est*=UVE, I had been, He or HUVE Estado, I have been, HAV*ia Estado*, I had been. Now I think no one can doubt, that the UVE after the *Est* in *Est*=UVE is the *h*=UVE before the *Estado*; and we cannot, I think, doubt, that the ABA in *Est*=ABA has the same force, as the UVE in *Est*=UVE. We certainly should not have doubted about this, if in *Havia* the B had been adopted, quasi *h*-AB*ia*, as it is in *h*-UB=*Ieramos*. By these minute circumstances it is, that such facts are hidden from our view. Now we cannot doubt, that the AB in *Est*-ABA belongs to the AB in ^*St*=AB=*Am*; and if the future had been in the regular form *St*=Av-*i*, we should not have doubted, that the Uv in *Uve* belonged to the Av in *Avi*. In Italian, the tense, which we may consider as corresponding with *Est*=AB-*a*, ^*St*=AB=*Am*, appears under the form of ^V, ^*St*=AV-*a*.

In the AREM, and EREM, of Am=AREM, *Mon*=EREM, &c., we have the ERAM of the Auxiliary. In the past tenses, *Amav*=ERAM, *Amav*=ERIM, *Amav*=ERO, *Amav*=ISSEM, we have the ERAM, ERO, ESSEM, as in the past tenses of the Auxiliary, *Fu*=ERAM, &c. In the passive of Latin verbs we have the form *Am*=OR, *Am*=ARIS, &c.; or, if we put the terminations only, *Or*, *Aris*, *Atur*, *Amur*, *Amini*, *Antur*; and here I cannot decide on the nature of the Composition. We have the Element ^R however introduced,

and

and likewise the Element ^N, the latter of which we shall see familiarly adopted in the Greek. We shall find, that the Element ^N or ^NT is peculiarly applied in the third persons plural of verbs. The Element ^R denotes *Being*, through a wide extent of Language; and hence we have the terminations OR and ER, as in Amat=OR, *Lov*=ER. As a verb, we see it in the English ARE. The Element ^R, as I before observed, is perpetually connected with the Element ^S, and was, I believe, originally derived from it. In German, *Er* is the familiar pronoun for He. Some of the tenses of the Passive are acknowledged to be formed from the Auxiliary verb *Amatus Sum* vel *Fui;* and thus we see, that they are constructed in a similar manner to those in the Active voice, except that in one case the auxiliary is separated from the participle, or part expressing the action of the verb, and in the other it is united with it.—Let us note, in the AT, AM, ANT, of the Passive inflection, *Or, Aris*, AT=*ur*, AM=*ur*, *Amani*, ANT-*ur*, the auxiliary of the Active. The ^R, as the characteristic of the Passive verbs, seems to be derived from the Celtic *Air*, (Gal.) *Iar*, (Irish,) which are used to form what is called the Preterite, or the Passive Participle, as *Air Cruinuchadh* Assembled, Congregatus.

Let us now consider the verb of *Being* in Greek, and the composition of other verbs in that Language. The Greek *Eimi*, (Ειμι, Sum,) may be either quasi Ej=^Mi, and therefore may correspond with Es=*Um*, or it may directly be referred to AM. In some Dialects we have at once EMMI, or EMI, (Εμμι, Ημι,) as I before observed. The whole tense runs thus; EIMI, EIS or EI, ESTI, EST*on*, EST*on*, Es*men*, (in some Dialects, *Eimen*, *Emen*, *Eimes*,) ESTE, EISI; and in another Dialect, ENTI, Ειμι, (Εμμι, Ημι, D. Æ.) Εις, Ει, Εστι, Εστον, Εστον, Εσμεν, (Ειμεν, Εμεν, Ειμες, I. P. D.) Εστε, Εισι, (Εντι, D.) The simpler state of this tense is EIMI, EIS, ESTI, EM, ESTE, ENTI, as in Latin UM, ES, EST, UM, EST, UNT. The imperfect runs thus: *En, Es, E, Eton, Eten, Emen, Ete, Esan,* (Ην, Ης, Η, Ητον, Ητην, Ημεν,

Ημεν, Ητε, Ησαν.) Here we see the Element ^N appears. Let us mark in the Esm of *Esmen*, (Εσμεν,) the true form of the *Es* in Esum-*us*, as it would be from Esum. This might lead us to conclude, that *Eimi* was originally Ejmi. In the Em, Eso, Eto, Emeth, Esthe, Ento, of Em=*en*, Eso, Eto, Emeth=*on*, Esth=*on*, Esth=*en*, Emeth=*a*, Esthe, Ento, (Ημην, Ησο, Ητο, Ημεθον, Ησθον, Ησθην, Ημεθα, Ησθε, Ηντο,) we have the same fundamental form which we have in Latin. In Es=Om=*ai*, (Εσομαι,) we have the Es=Om, as in the Latin Es-Um, and Ess-Em. The Greek Auxiliary differs from the Latin by the introduction of the Radical ^N.

The Greek verbs, like the Latin, are compounded of the part expressing the sense conveyed by the Verb and the Auxiliary. As *Tupto*, *Tupt*=Eis, *Tupt*=ei, *Tupt*=Eton, *Tupt*=Eton, *Tupt*=Omen, *Tupt*=Ete, *Tupt*=Ousi, (Τυπτω, τυπτεις, τυπτει, τυπτετον, τυπτετον, τυπτομεν, τυπτετε, τυπτουσι,) are compounded of *Tupt*, and of Eis, Ei, Eton, Eton, Omen, Ete, Ousi, corresponding with the Eis, Ei, Eston, Eston, *Esmen*, or Emen, *Este*, in one Dialect Ete, Eisi, (Εις, Ει, Εστον, Εστον, Εσμεν, Εστε, Ετε, P. Εισι,) of the Auxiliary. We see here, that one form of the second person of the Auxiliary *Ei*, (Ει,) is adopted for the third in the ordinary verbs. Perhaps the Ei was originally Ej. The ^M we see is lost in the first person of the present tense of the Active voice, as it is in the Latin; but it is found in the same tense of the Passive and Middle voices, and in various other tenses, *Tupt*=Om*ai*, &c. &c. (Τυπτομαι,) which means literally, '*Beat*=Am I.'

The ^M is likewise found in that class of verbs, which are called Verbs in Mi, *Tith*=Emi, (Τιθημι.) In the composition of these verbs we see likewise the Auxiliary, as *Tith*=Emi, Es, Esi, Eton, Eton, Emen, Ete, Eisi, (Τιθημι, τιθης, &c.) Here the third person singular contains, as it commonly does, the Element ^S, as Esi; and though in the third person plural we have *Eisi*, yet in a Dialect we have the familiar Element ^N, Enti, *Tith*-Enti (Τιθεντι, Dor.)

In

In the Passive voice of the ordinary verbs we see a similar composition of the part expressing the sense of the Verb and the Auxiliary; as in *e-Tupt=Omen*, *e-Tup=En*, *Tup=Esomai*, (Ετυπτομην, ετυπην, τυπησομαι,) which are formed from *Tupt*, *Tup*, and *Omen*, or *Emen*, (Ημην,) *En*, (Ην,) and *Esomai*, (Εσομαι.) The Auxiliary *Emen*, (Ημην,) is thus formed; *Emen*, *Eso*, *Eto*, *Emethon*, *Esthon*, *Esthen*, *Emetha*, *Esthe*, *Ento*; and *e-Tupt=Omen* is thus formed, *e-Tupt=*{*Omen*, *ou*, or *Eso*, *Eto*, *Omethon*, *Esthon*, *Esthen*, *Ometha*, *Esthe*, *Onto*, (ετυπτομην, ετυπτου, vel ετυπτεσο apud veteres, ετυπτετο, &c.) The present tense is formed in a similar manner, though without any addition in the first person to the ^M, or Am. It coincides most in the singular and plural with the Latin, though it is somewhat in a simpler state. Thus we have *Tupt=*{Om*ai*, Es*ai*, Et*ai*, Omet*ha*, Est*he*, Ont*ai*, (Τυπτομαι, τυπτη, vel τυπτεσαι apud veteres, τυπτεται, τυπτομεθα, τυπτεσθε, τυπτονται,) which coincides most with the Latin form, Um, Es, Est, Umus, Est=*is*, Unt.

The Infinitive of the Greeks follows the two forms of Ein*ai*, (Ειναι,) and of Esthai in *Es*=Esthai, (Εσεσθαι,) as in *Tupt*=Ein, *Tetuph*=Enai, *Tupt*=Esthai, (Τυπτειν, Τετυφεναι, Τυπτεσθαι.) In some forms of the infinitive we have a compound of the Elements ^M and ^N, as *Em=En*, *Em=Enai* (Εμεν, Εμεναι, Ion.), and in the other verbs *Tupt=Emen*, *Tupt=Emenai*, (Τυπτεμεν, Τυπτεμεναι, A. D.) The Esthai of the Greeks corresponds with the Esse, Estre or Etre, Esser, of the Latins, French, Italians, &c. If *Einai* should be quasi *Ej-Nai*, then the *Nai*, and *En*, in *Ej=Nai*, and *Em=En*, will be the form of the Infinitive added to the verbs of Being, Ej and Em. In some of the Dialects of the Teutonic, the Infinitive terminates in *N*. Thus in German and Saxon we have *Lob*=En, *Lufi*=An, To Love; in Gothic, *Sokj*=An, To Seek, &c. &c. In the Hindostan Dialects the Infinitive ends in Na, as *Mar*=Na, To Beat, *Jaou*=Na, To Go, (Hadley's Gram. p. 37,) where let us note the *Mar* and the *Jaou*, corresponding with the English *Marr* and *Go*.

Go. The verb of Being in these Dialects is *Hona*, To be, which corresponds with the Greek *Einai*, (Ειναι); and the present tense is formed by using *Hyn*, the verb of Being, after the word expressing the action intended, as "Myn Dourtay *Hyn*, I am running," (Hadley, p. 37.) where if the term *Dourtay*, Running, was joined with *Hyn*, as *Dourtayhyn*, it would be precisely the same composition as *e-Tupton*, (Ετυπτον,) from *Tupt* and *On*, or *En*, (Ην, Eram,) I was beating. We perceive sometimes the ^M in the Infinitive of Greek verbs, as in the *Tupt*=EM-*en*, (Τυπτεμεν); and this likewise takes place in some of the Celtic Dialects, as in the Irish and Galic, as *Dean*AM, *Dhean*AM*h*, To Do, a verb common to both Dialects. The present tense may be considered to be the same, *Dean*=AM, I Do, or I AM Doing, where the sense of AM is the same in both instances.

In the Irish Dialect we have ATA=*Im*, ATA=*Oir*, ATA *Se*, ATA=*Moid*, ATA=*Thaoi*, ATA=*Id*, for all the persons of the present tense, *I am, thou art*, &c. We have likewise ATA and As used for all the persons, when accompanied by the pronouns, ATA or As *Me*, I am, ATA or As *Tu*, Thou art, &c. &c. We have likewise AN with the Pronouns used for all persons of the present, AN *Me*, AN *Tu*, &c., Am I, Art thou, &c. We see, that the AN coincides with the EEN, (Ην,) of the Greeks, though they are applied to different tenses. It may perhaps be worthy of remark, that the Celtic and Greek verbs, AN and EEN, (Ην,) agree even in point of the time, which they express; as some have observed, that the Greek *Een* or *Eeen*, (Ην, Εην,) was used for the Present tense.

Ουκ αρα μουνον ΕΗΝ εριδων γενος, αλλ' επι γαιαν
Εισι δυω. (*Hes. Op.* A. v. 11.)

"Non sane unum *Est* contentionum genus, sed in terrâ sunt "duo." The later writers seem to have adopted this use of the word, in order to give their compositions an air of antiquity. (See the Poem under the name of Musæus, v. 16.) In the perfect

tense of the Irish verb, we have Bha *Me*, I was, or have been; where in *Bha* we see the same form as in Fui, and the English *Be*. Some might conjecture, that *Fui* was quasi *Fuj*, and that it belonged to the Element FD, FJ, &c.; yet we shall conclude, I think, from this instance, where *Bha* and *Fui* coincide in form, and from other examples of the same kind, that the Elements ^B and BD, FD, &c. are distinct from each other. The Element BD, FT, &c. denotes Being through the whole compass of Language, and accordingly, in the same tense with *Bha*, we have Bhad*has*, I was, and likewise in other tenses, *Do* Bhios, I was, Biodh, Be thou, &c. &c. In Irish, we have both Is and As, as the impersonal verb, corresponding with Is, (Eng.) &c. We perceive in Ata=*Im*, Ata *Me*, that Ata is the verb of Being; and we see, that *Im* is an addition, which, according to my hypothesis, belongs to *Am*, (Eng.) We have from hence another proof, that Es=*Um* is the true form in the Latin verb of Being,—that Es and *Um* are distinct portions, and that Es is the part, corresponding with the terms for Being, under the same Element, Es, Est, &c.

We find the same loss of the vowel breathing in the Celtic verb, as in the Latin. Not only At*a*=*Im* signifies I am, but likewise ^Ta=*Im*, or ^Tsa=*Im*, ^S^=*Am*, ^S^=*Om*; but even here we see the verb of Being distinct from the remaining part; since in the other persons, *Thou art*, *He is*, we have Ta *tu*, Ta *se;* though the breathing before the T is still lost. In the plural the Grammarians put Ata *sinn*, *sibh*, *siad*, *We*, *ye*, *they are*, where we see the true form. In Irish and Galic the Infinitive ends in ^M, as it sometimes does in Greek, as *Sam*, *Taim*, To be, which belongs directly to the present, as we before observed. We perceive, in the ^*Moid* and the ^*Thaoi* of the first and second persons plural of the verb Ata=^*Moid*, Ata=^*Thaoi*, the *Mus* and the *Est*, or ST, in *Su*-Mus, Est*is*. In the Galic Dialect of the Celtic, we have Ata or Tha *mi*, I am, Tha *thu*, Tha *e*, Thou art, He is, &c. We have likewise Is in

all

all the persons of the present, Is *Mi*, Is *Tu*, Is *E*, &c., I am, Thou art, He is, &c.; and, moreover, Am mi, *An* tu, *An* e, which mean, Am I, Art thou, Is he, &c., where Am, unless put for *An*, corresponds precisely with the English *Am*. In Galic likewise we have *Bha* or *Bu* mi, I was, &c., and in other tenses and moods we have the Element BD, as Bith*idh mi*, I shall be, Bith *thu*, Be thou, &c. &c. The form of a regular Galic or Irish verb, as given by Lhuyd, in the Present tense, is, *Sgriobh*, } Aim, Air, Aidh, Am=Aoid, Aoid*h*=Esi, Aids=Ion, I write, &c. In the first and third persons of the singular, and in the first and second of the plural, we see the Latin form, *Scrib* } Am, At, Am=Us, At=Is, which corresponds with *Sgriobh* } Aim, Aidh, Am=Aoid, Aoid*h*=Esi.

In Welsh, the verb of Being is Wyf, I am, Wyt or Wyd, Thou art, *Yw*, *Mae*, Oes, *Sydd*, *Si*, He is, Ym, Ych, Ynt, We, Ye, They are. The *Yw* denotes, we see, Being, under the vowel form; and this we shall find sometimes to take place, as in the English *He*. The English *He* is derived probably from the Consonant form, as Hyse (Sax.) Is (Lat.) as the Etymologists suppose; and so, I imagine, are the other words denoting Being, which are expressed by Vowels. In *Mae* we see the Element ^M, and in *Sydd* we see a similar composition to the Latin *Sit*, which I conceive to be Es-It. In ^S-Ydd the vowel breathing before the ^S is lost, and so it is in Si, as it was in the Irish and Galic Ta. In Wyf we have the Am of the Galic, English, &c., where *F* and *M* have passed into each other; and in the other persons, Wyt or Wyd, Oes, Ym, Ych, Ynt, we have the simplest state of the verb of Being, corresponding with the Um, Es, Est, Um, Est, Unt of the Latins, in ^*S*=Um, Es, Est, ^*S*=Um=*us*, Est=*is*, ^*S*=Unt. The simplicity of the Welsh verb accords most with that of the Persian, conveying the same idea; and this resemblance will be more striking in the Plural, Ym, Ych, Ynt, (Welsh), Aim, Aid, And, (Pers.) The Welsh verbs, like others, are compounds of the part expressing the sense

sense conveyed by the verbs and the auxiliary verb. The present tense in Welsh is likewise expressed by YD or YTT, and the auxiliary verb, before produced, added to it, as YD=WYF, YD=WYT, or WYD, *Yd=Yo*, YD=YM, YD=YCH, YD=YNT. Here we have the verb of Being joined with itself. The YD or YTT I conceive to express the verb of Being, corresponding with WYT, WYD, OES, (Welsh,) Es, EST, (Lat.) &c., Is, &c.; and to form precisely the same species of union, when joined with *Wyf*, &c., which we see in the Latin ES=UM, ES=IS, ETS=IT, ES=UM-*us*, ES=IT-*is*, ES=UNT, or ESS=EM, ESS=ES, ESS=ET, ESS=EM-*us*, ESS=ET-*is*, ESS=ENT. The Persian verb, like the Welsh and other verbs, is a compound, as we have seen, of the part conveying the idea of the verb, and the auxiliary. The Persians likewise have combined the term denoting Being, and belonging to the verb of Being, with that verb of Being, or with itself. We have seen, that هستن *Hstn*, or HAST-*an*, signifies To Be, corresponding with EST, ESSE, &c. &c. The present tense of this verb is formed of HAST and the Auxiliary, as HAST-M, *Hast*-Y, HAST, HAST-YM, HAST-YD, HAST-^ND. We see in the Persian verb, that the third person is HAST, which is either the verb of Being in its simple state, or a contraction for *Hast*-AST, as I before observed.

In Welsh we see that YD is added to *Yw*, another form of the third person, as *Yd=Yw*; but in what is called the Passive, we have YD=YS, which is sometimes simply Ys. In Welsh, as in the other Languages, which we have noticed, the Element ^N appears as an auxiliary verb, and is adopted in the inflexions of verbs, as in the Greek *Etupt*-ON, &c. (ετυπτ-ον,) from En, (Hv, Eram.) Thus in the Welsh we have *Oedd*=WN, I was; and in the other persons we find *Oedd=It*, or *Oedd=Yt*, Thou wast, *Oedd*, or *Yd=Oedd*, He was, &c.; where there is a similar union, OEDD=IT, &c., which we have before seen. In another tense we have *Bu*=M, *Bu*=OST, *Bu*, *Bu*=OM, *Bu*=OCH, *Bu*=ANT or ONT, I have been, &c. Here we have a com-

a compound of *Bu* and the auxiliary. The *Bu* corresponds with the *Bha* and *Bu* in the other Celtic Dialects, and with the *Fui* of the Latins. We may observe, in the *Bu*=M, that the ^M or AM is used, which is the ordinary form in other Languages, instead of WYF. We find the same termination in other verbs, as *Aeth*=YM, I came. In general, however, the ^F, or *Wyf*, &c. is used, when added to the verb, as in *Bydd*=AF, I shall be, *Bydd*=WYF, *Byth*=WYF, *B*=WYF, which latter is formed of *Bu* and *Wyf*, and is not a contraction of *Byth* and *Wyf*, as the Welsh Grammarians imagine. Let us mark the *Bydd* and *Byth*, which in other moods and tenses is *Bod*, *Buas*=*Wn*, &c., where we see the Element BD, as in *Bhadhas*, *Bhios*, *Biodh*, &c. in other Dialects of the Celtic. In Persian, the same auxiliary is used, and in the same manner. In the Infinitive, بودن بود *Bud-en*, *Bud* signifies To be; and in the Preterite, *Bud*=M, *Bud*=Y, *Bud*, *Bud*=IM, *Bud*=YD, *Bud*=ND, mean I was, Thou wast, &c.; where the plural of this tense, *Bud*=IM, *Bud*-YD, *Bud*-ND, precisely corresponds with a similar combination in the Welsh, as *Buas*=EM, *Buas*=ECH, *Buas*=ENT, We, Ye, They had been.

The Welsh Language supplies us with the idea, from which the Element BD denotes Being; and we shall find, that it is precisely the same as that, from which I suppose EST, Is, &c. to be derived. I conceive, that EST, Is, &c., as denoting Existence, is taken from the idea of what is *Placed—Situated*, and belongs to the sense conveyed by IST*emi*, (Ιστημι, Colloco, Statuo; at in aor. 2 perf. plusq. perf. Sto, Consisto; unde *Est;—Esse*, Natum, Ortum *Esse*,) or in other words, that EST, &c. has precisely the same original and metaphorical meaning as *Existo*, To Be, To *Exist*, from *Ex* and *Sisto*, "To Set, or be made to stand;—To continue," &c. *Bód* signifies in Welsh "To Be," and likewise "An *a*BODE, a dwelling, a "mansion, an habitation." Thus we see the Welsh BÔD belongs to the English *a-Bode*, *Bide*, *Bed*, *Booth*, &c. &c.; and the Hebrew בת

בת BT, a House, Temple, &c. &c. The word signifies a *Daughter* in Hebrew, from the idea of *the Being*—the '*Existens* Persona.' We may now see, that *Bôd*, *a-Bode*, *Bide*, &c. belong to Bod-*en*, (Germ.) *Ped-on*, (Πεδον, Solum,) the Ground, for the same reason that Est, Is, Ist*emi*, (Ιστημι,) do to Est*ia*, (Εστια,) &c. &c. the Earth. Through the whole compass of Language the Element *BD* denotes *Being:* Hence we have the great Deity worshipped all over the East—Budda. We shall see, that the Armoric form for the verb To Be is *Beza;* from which, as we shall now understand, the name *Beza* is derived; and thus we see, that the Budda, the Deity of the East, and *Beza*, have the same meaning.

In some compound tenses in the Welsh Language, the *Bum*, *Buaswn*, *Byddaf*, become *Fum*, *Fuaswn*, *Fyddaf;* and the Welsh Grammarians have illustrated this composition in the verbs *Henyw*, *Cenyw*, *Deryw*, *Goryw;* as *Han-Fum*, &c. &c. We may represent the terminations of the ordinary Welsh verbs thus; 1st Person sing. *Car*}Wn, Ais, Aswn, Af, (I loved, I have loved, I had loved, I shall love,) &c. 2d Pers. It, Aist, As=it, *i.* 3d P. *ai*, Odd, Asai. 1st P. Pl. Em, As=Om, As=Em, *Wn.* 2d P. Ech, As=Och, As=Ech, Wch. 3d P. Ent, As=Ant, As=Ent, Ant. In some tenses *Cer* is written *Car.* The formation of these tenses is manifest. We see in the first person singular, that the auxiliaries belonging to the Elements ^N, ^S, ^F, are adopted, as Wn, Ais, Af, in a simple state, or AS=Wn in a compound state, as in Oedd=Wn. The second and third persons singular belong to the Element ^S, &c. according to the ordinary analogy, except in *Ai*, which is quasi Aj; and the plural, through all the tenses, is formed likewise according to the ordinary analogy, either in a simple or compound state, ^M, ^S, &c. ^NT, or ^S, &c.=^M, ^S, &c.=^S, &c. ^S, &c.=NT; except in one tense, where in the first person plural we have the Element ^N or Wn, as in the Greek Tupt}*Om*=En, (Τυπτομεν,) though here we have both the ^M and the ^N.

In

In Cornish, *Baz*, or *Bos*, signifies To *Be*; and this we see coincides with the *Bod* of the Welsh, &c. The first person of the present tense is Ov, Ass=Av, Ass=Am, where, in the Ov, Av, Am, we see both the forms of the Element, as that of ^V, and likewise the ordinary form ^M. In Welsh we have seen it to be ^F, as Wyf. These forms, Ov, Av, will decide our opinions on the origin of Av, Iv, in the Latin *Am*=Av-*i*, *Aud*=Iv-*i*. Let us mark in Ass=Am the true form of ^S=Um, as in the old word Es=Um, and the Russian ES=Me. The second person is Oz, Ass=Az, Ydh=Oz; the third *Ma*, *Yu*, Ez, Ysy, Otte, Ydzhi; the first plural *Oni*, Ass=*on*, the second *Oh*, *Ouχ*, *Yz-Ouχ*, and the third *Ynz*, ^*M*=*Onz*, *Ym*=*Onz*. In the third person singular the *Ma* is the *Mae* of the Welsh, where the Element ^M denotes Being, as in the first persons singular and plural, ^*S*=Um, ^*S*=Um-*us*, &c. In the third person plural, ^*M*=*Onz*, or *Ym*=*ONZ*, we see a compound of the ^M and the ONZ, the ^NT, the ordinary form of that person. In Cornish, we have *By*=^*M*, I have been, corresponding with *Bu*=*M*, Welsh; where the *By* and *Bu* coincide together. The *B* is turned into a *V* in Cornish, as *By-An*, or *Vy-An*, &c. In the Armoric, *Beza* means To Be, as in the other Dialects. The term So is used in all persons of the present; where the breathing before the ^S is lost, as it is before the ^T in the Galic and Irish ^*Tha*, ^*Ta*; though it is again found in Ata. The present tense in Armoric is likewise expressed by *Oun*, Out, *Eo*, or *E*, Omp, Och, Int, and Ez-*Oun*, Ez-Out, Ez-*Eo*, I am, Thou art, He is; and in the plural, Ez=Omp, Ez=Och, Ez=Int, we find likewise the same composition, which we have seen in the Welsh Yd=Ym, Yd=Ych, Yd=Ynt,—in the Persian *Hast*=Ym, *Hast*=Yd, *Hast*=^Nd,—and in the Es=Um, Es-It, Es=Unt, belonging to the ancient Latin form, which Vossius has recorded, *Esumus*, *Esitis*, *Esunt*.

In the Hindostan Dialects, Hona signifies To Be, where we have the ^N, as in the Greek E*inai*, (Ειναι, Esse,) &c. The Gram-

marians

marians acknowledge, that from this *Hona* is derived the *Na* of the Infinitive mood, of the verbs in these Dialects, as *Mar*=NA, To Beat, *Jaou*=NA, To Go. I have shewn, that *Jaou* belongs to *Go*, and that in the Teutonic Dialects the Infinitive ends in ^N. Thus then, *Jaou*=NA is precisely the same combination as the corresponding word and tense in the German *Gehe*=N, the Saxon *Ga*=N, the Belgic *Gae*=N, and the English *Ga*=N*g*. The Greek Infinitive ends, we know, in EIN, &c. from EIN*ai*, (Ειναι,) as *Tupt*=EIN. The Persian ends in ^N, or in *Idan*, as the Grammarians inform us. The *Idan* in Persian verbs must be considered as having arisen from هستن HASTAN, To be; and in *Hastan* we plainly see the composition of هست HST, Is, the part expressing the verb, and AN, the termination of the Infinitive. In Persian the Infinitives frequently end likewise in ^*Dan* and ^*Tan*. In the Hindostan Dialects, HYN means "There is, It is, We are," &c. which we see precisely coincides with the Greek *En*, (Hν, Erat,) and the AN of the Irish; AN E, He is, It is, AN sinn, We are, &c. In the Hindostan Dialects, TA or TAU, TEE, &c. are used with the Pronouns in all the persons of the present, as the Irish TA is. Thus in the Hindostan we have *Ma*, *To*, Oo}TA, and in Irish TA}*Me*, *Tu*, *Se*, for I am, Thou art, He is. In these Dialects, HOOVA signifies *Am*, which is the same form as the OV and the AV of the Cornish. I have before observed, that TA and KA form participles, *Dour*=TA, Running, *Dour*=KA, Having run. In the Irish, says General Vallancey, "the Supines end in TA and TE, which form the "participle of the Passive voice, which, with the auxiliary verb "*Sam*, or *Tam*, go through all the tenses; as *Gonaim*, I wound, "*Taim Gon*=TA, I am wounded." (Gram. p. 115.) In Gipsey, SE is *Is*, which answers to the Hindostan TA, &c.; and still more agrees in form with the Celtic terms SI, So, &c. In Gipsey, likewise, So—SA means *How*, *What;* as So SE *Romané*, *What Is it in Gipsey?*—SA *Shan Ria*, SA *Shan Raunéa*, *How do you do, Sir? How do*

do you do, Madam? The *Ria* and *Raunéa* belong to *Rex*, and *Regina*, (Lat.) *Re*, (Ital.) *Roi*, *Reine*, (Fr.) *Rajah*, (Hindoo,) &c. The *Shan* I conceive to be a compound of *Sha*, a variety of *Se*, to denote the participle *Being*, and *An*, which may be called the verb, corresponding with the Hindostan *Hona*, To Be. The *Ta* or *Tau* of the Hindostan, when added to the part denoting the action of the verb to express the participle, is precisely the same. Thus, when they say *Dour* TA *Hoon*, 'I am running,' *Dour* TAU *Hyn*, 'We are 'running,' the *Ta* and *Tau* may be considered as separate parts of Speech, denoting *Being;* and TA=*Hoon*, TA=*Hyn*, mean precisely 'I am, we are being,' just as I conceive SHA=AN, or SH'=AN, to do.

I shall now examine the formation of the verbs in some of the Modern Languages; and we shall find, that they follow a similar analogy to those, which I have before unfolded. In the *Estre* or ETRE, ÉTÉ, &c. of the French, we have the simple representation of the Element ^S, ^T, denoting Being; and in ET-*Ant*, the Gerund, as it is called, or the Participle, we have the ANT corresponding with the Latin *Am*}ANS, ANT-*is*. In the *S=Uis*, *S=Erai*, *S=Erois*, *S=Ois*, we have the ^S, as in the Latin ^S-*Um*, where the breathing before the ^S is lost; and the UIS, ERAI, EROIS, OIS, should be considered as the simpler state of the auxiliary verb. In ET-*Ois*, &c. &c. the breathing before the ^S or ^T appears, as in Es-*Um*, Es-*It*, Ess-*Em*, Ess-*Es*. In *Fû*=SSE we have a compound of the Elements F^ and ^S, as in the Latin *Fu*=ISSE=^*m*, the Welsh *Bu*=As-*wn*, &c. &c. The ordinary French verbs are compounded, as the auxiliary is, of the part expressing the action of the verb and the auxiliary in its simpler form. In the Is, Es, EST, OMMES, ÊTES, ONT, of *S-Uis*, *Es*, *Est*, *S=Ommes*, *Etes*, *S=Ont*, we have one simple state, which agrees, we see, with the Latin form; except that the first person singular belongs to the Element ^S. Another simple state is the OIS, OIS, OIT, IONS, IEZ, OIENT, of the compound of *Et*}*Ois*, *Ois*, *Oit*, &c. &c., which differs nothing

from the former, except that the first person plural belongs to the Element ^N, and the second person plural is in its simplest state. In the *Erai* of *S=Erai*, we have the simplest form, coinciding with *Ero*, (Lat.); and the *Erois*, of *S=Erois*, supplies us with another simple form, though this is still a compound of *Er* and *Ois*. The Er=Ois, Er=Oit, coincides precisely with Er=As, Er=At, (Lat.) a compound of the Elements ^R=^S. We shall find, when we examine the French verbs, that they are generally composed of the part expressing the verb, and the auxiliaries under these forms. We shall observe, that the exception is chiefly to be found in the first and third persons singular, which sometimes end in a vowel. In *Sent*}Is, Is, It, Imes, Ites, *Ir*-Ent, we have the first form, except that the ^R is added to the ^N in the third person plural. In the Sent}Ois, Ois, Ois, Ions, Iez, Ent, we have the second form. In the future and conditional, as Sent}Irai, Ir=Ois, &c., we have two other forms. Though in the first person singular of *Sent*=Irai, we have the simpler form Irai; yet in the second person, and in the plural Sent}Ir=As, Ir=Ons, we have the compound one, as in *Sent*}Ir=Ois, Ir-Ions, &c. In Iss=Ions of *Sent=Issions* we have a similar combination to Et-Ions. The Gerund or Participle is commonly formed, as *Et*=Ant is, by adding ^N to the part expressing the sense of the verb, as *Parl*-Ant; but it is sometimes formed by adding what corresponds with *Etant*, as *Ag ir*, *Ag*=Issant, quasi *Ag=Etant*, &c. &c.

In the French verb of Possession, Av-*oir*, we have *Eu*, *Aurai*, *Eus*, *Eusse*, which are quasi Ev, Av-^*Rai*, Ev-^*S*, Ev-^*Sse*. In the *Ai*, *As*, *A*, *Ont*, I, You, He, They *Have*, the *V* has been lost. In the English verb of Possession, *Have*, we find the Radical ^V, or ^B, lost in the Past tense *Had*, as it is in the German *Hatte*. The ^D and the ^T represent the past time; and thus *Had* and *Hatte* are quasi *Haved*, Hav-*D*, Hab-*Tte*. In the English *Had*, used as a participle, 'I Have *Had*,' the radical ^V or ^B is likewise lost; but in the German it is preserved, with the *T* after it, corresponding with

with ^D, as 'Ich Habe *ge*-HAB-*T*, I Have *Had.*' The Element ^V or ^B is likewise lost in German and English, in the second and third persons of the Present, as 'Du *Hast*, Er *Hat*, 'Thou *Hast*, He *Has.*' In the plural, the Germans use HAB=*En*, HAB=*T*, HAB=*En*, We, Ye, They *Have*, where the Radical again appears. The Saxon form will decide on the justness of my observation; as HÆBBE, HÆF=*St*, (I *Have*, Thou *Ha=St,*) HÆBB=*Ath*, HÆF=*T*, (He *Ha-S,*) HABB=*Ath*, (We *Have,*) &c., HÆF=*De*, I *Ha=D,*) HÆF=*T*, (He *Ha=D.*) In the Gothic, HAB=AIDA is 'He '*Ha=D*', &c. &c.

In the Italian and Spanish Auxiliary, where the S exists at the beginning of the word *S=Ono*, *S=Aro*, *Sia*, *S=Arei*, (Ital.) *Soi*, *S=Ere*, *Sea*, *Ser*, *S=Ido*, (Span.) it is to be considered as derived from the same source as the S in the Latin and French *Sum*, *Suis*, &c. in which I have shewn the breathing before the S to have been lost. In the Ess*ere* of the Italians we have the true form; and in *Essendo*, *Sendo*, we have both forms. The Italian participle *Stato* is directly borrowed from *Stare*, to which, as I have shewn, *Essere* ultimately belongs; yet the ancient Italians used *Ess=Uto* and ^*S=Uto*, to which latter form the Spanish ^*S=Ido* belongs. The present tense of the Italian verb is S=*Ono*, *Sei*, *e. S=Iamo*, ^*S=Iete*, ^*S=Ono*, where in the plural we see the verb of Being in its simplest form, IAMO, IETE, ONO, ^M, ^T, ^N, as in the Persián AIM, AID, AND,—in the Armoric OMP, OCH, INT,—and in the Welsh YM, YCH, YNT. The form ^M, ^T, ^N represents the plural of the Italian verbs, in many of the tenses. In the Imperfect *Era*, *Eri*, *Era*, *Er=Amo*, *Er=Ate*, *Er=Ano*, I was, &c., we see the *Er=am* of the Latins in its simple state, as it is in *Ero*, (Lat.); and in the *Amo*, *Ate*, *Ano*, we have the ordinary termination. The singular, we see, is no compound; and the plural, though a compound, is still in a simpler state than the Latin *Er=Am-Us*, *Er=At-Is*. But the *Er=Amo* and *Er=Ate* are sometimes written *Er=*AV*=Amo*, *Er=*AV*=Ate*,

AV=*Ate*, where the AV is inserted, corresponding to ^B and ^V in the Latin *Am*}AB-*Am*, Av-*i;* and hence ^V}a, i, a, Amo, Ate, Ano, added to the part expressing the action of the verb, forms the imperfect in Italian, as *Amava*, *Amavi*, *Amava*, *Amavamo*, *Amavate*, *Amavano*, I did love. In *Fui*, *F=Osti*, *Fu*, *F=Ummo*, *F=Oste*, *F=Urono*, 'I was,' &c. we see the simpler form of the Latin *Fui;* and in F^=}*Ossi*, *Ossi*, *Osse*, *Oss=Imo*, *Oste*, *Oss=Ero*, we have Fu=Iss-*em*, in its simple and more original state. We have here likewise the termination of *Ero*. The future and conditional tenses are S}*Aro*, *Arai*, *Ara*, *Ar=Emo*, *Ar=Ete*, *Ar=Anno;* S}*Arei*, *Ar=Esti*, *Ar=Ebbe*, *Ar=Emmo*, *Ar=Este*, *Ar=Ebbe=Ero*. We see in *Ebbe* the *Ebbi*, I Had, *Ebbe*, He Had, and the *AV* in *Er*=AV=*Amo;* and in *Ero*, the termination, we have the *Ar* and *Era*, I was. In the Latin, the ^R likewise supplies the termination *Fu*=Ere. Thus in ^*S=Ar=Ebb=Ero*, from S=*Ar*, and *Ebb=Ero*, They Had, we have a compound, consisting of four parts, belonging to three Elements, S, ^R, ^B, each of which was originally significant.

The Italian Grammarians represent, in a concise manner, the mode of forming their ordinary verbs, thus, *Imp. Vo*, *Vi*, *Va*, *Vamo*, *Vate*, *Vano*. Fut. *Ro*, *Rai*, *Ra*, *Remo*, *Remo*, *Ranno*. Imp. Subj. *Ssi*, *Ssi*, *Sse*, *Ssimo*, *Ste*, *Ssero*. Conditional, *Rei*, *Resti*, *Rebbe*, *Remmo*, *Reste*, *Rebbero*, as *Am*=Ava, *Am*=Ero, *Am*=Assi, *Am*=Erei, where we perceive the formation of the ordinary verbs from the simpler forms of the auxiliary, such as we have seen in all the other instances. In the verb of Possession we have three forms in Italian, Av, Ab, and Eb, as Av-*Ete*, Abbia, Ebbi. We have seen, that the Preterite of this word has supplied a part in the formation of the conditional of the ordinary verbs; and the Av, as we have likewise seen, furnishes another portion in the Imperfect, *Am*=Av-*a*. The Preterite is formed thus; Ebbi, *AV=Esti*, Ebbe, *AV=Emmo*, *AV=Este*, Ebbero. The *Hanno*, They Have, of the present tense, was formerly written *Habb=Ono*, which is probably the true form.

form. The present singular was likewise formerly written *Abbo*, *Abbi*, *Abbe*, instead of *Ho*, *Hai*, *Ha*. As the tenses of the verb of Being, in its ordinary state, are formed by the union of parts, denoting Being, with each other; so, in the verb of Possession, the same union takes place, as Av-Ev-*a*, Av=*r*=Ebbe, Av=*r*= Ebbero, which is of the same kind as the union in English, I Have Hav-*ed*, or *Had*, &c. &c.

It is the common opinion, that the Italian Language is a corruption of the Latin; and so indeed it may be considered, if we regard it in its present state, under one point of view, as abounding with more words directly taken from the Latin than any other. Yet if we look to the Radical part of the Language, as it appears in the formation of the verbs—the state of the Pronouns, the Particles, and the artifices of construction; we cannot say that it is more related to the Latin than the French, or any other of those Languages, whose affinity we have detailed in the preceding discussions. Indeed it is, in many respects, more remote from the Latin than various other Languages; as it appears to be more directly connected with some forms of the Celtic Dialects, from which the Latin itself is taken. It is difficult to speak on this subject with precision. That the great body of the Italian Language, as it is now written, has been directly taken from the Latin, as *Educazione*, *Contemplazione*, &c. &c.; we shall all agree; but these words seem to have been engrafted on the fundamental part of the Language, which I have before described, just as the corresponding words *Education*, *Contemplation*, &c. have been added to our own Language, and engrafted on the Teutonic Stock. The two cases only differ in this respect, that the Italian Language is furnished with a greater number of these borrowed terms than any other form of Speech. As we go back to the earlier stages of our own Language, these terms diminish, and may, at last, be said to disappear; and the Antiquaries in Italian Literature will discover,

discover, I imagine, that this fact is, in some degree, true of their Language likewise; when the words, of which it was composed in the earliest states of its existence, shall be well sifted and examined.—In a great variety of cases, all our judgment and caution will be necessary to decide on this question.—The Italian word, which is the object of our enquiry, may indeed have a parallel term in Latin; yet this, of itself, affords us no argument to conclude, that it is derived from that source. The word may be common to many forms of Speech, or there may be a parallel Celtic term, more particularly connected with it; and thus the Italian word may have arisen from the same source, to which the Latin word itself is to be directly referred. In some cases, we perhaps might more justly say, that the Latin word is derived from the Italian. Without, however, entangling ourselves in this idea, which, indeed, is somewhat difficult clearly to explain; it will be sufficient for us to enquire, whether the Italian word has passed into that Language through the medium of the Latin, or whether it was derived from any other source. This is the statement of a fact, the force of which we all understand, and which may sometimes be fully ascertained, either by internal or external evidence, that is, either by examining the nature of the word itself, or by historical evidence on the first introduction of the word into that Language.

In short, I imagine that the Fundamental part of the Italian Language should be considered as the remains of the more ancient form, from which the Latin Combinations were themselves derived. In the Roman times the original Language probably always remained in some parts of Italy, and so it possibly does at this very moment. That this is true in one sense, we all know; as the different Celtic dialects still remain, and are still spoken with little variation, as I imagine, from their more ancient forms.—I should not be surprized to hear of a tribe still existing in some quarter of Italy, among whom a Celtic dialect was preserved, which we should

should all agree to have been the immediate origin of the Latin Language, and the foundation of the present Italian. The attention of Mankind has never been turned to this question, nor have any investigations been instituted to elucidate subjects of such a nature. We are contented with the ordinary division of the Celtic Dialects into *Irish—Welsh—Armoric*, &c. &c.; and we are satisfied with discovering the more striking points of their resemblance and their difference. Perhaps, however, other varieties may be still found even in Europe, which might justly entitle them to the rank of new dialects; and from the consideration of these varieties, a series of important truths might be deduced in the study of Languages. As these, however, are speculations which would lead me into a vein of discussion, remote from the present purpose, I shall not now enlarge on this subject, but shall return to my observations on the Italian verbs, by which they were suggested.

These verbs cannot be said, I think, even on the most superficial view, to be derived from the Latin; and the principles, which I have unfolded, as operating in the formation of verbs in general, will shew us, that the more simple and genuine form, which the Italian verb exhibits, is not derived from the operation of corruption. — It would be indeed a dextrous and intelligent effect in the process of corruption, which should destroy only all the materials that were unnecessarily attached to the composition, and leave the mass in its most simple and original state. Now this, we see, is precisely the case in the Italian verb. The ^M, ^S, ^N, in *Am*}IAMO, ATE, ANO, represent, as we have seen, the original state; and *Us*, *Is*, in the Latin Am}AM-*Us*, IT-*is*, are unnecessary additions, belonging to a more complicated system. In the first person of the present tense of the auxiliary, denoting Being, we have *Sono*, which is not derived from *S=Um*, that is, from ^S^ and ^M, but it belongs to another form, ^S and ^N, and it is directly taken from the Celtic,

Celtic, Ez=Oun, (Armoric,) which, when the breathing before the Z is lost, becomes *Zoun*, coinciding with *Sono*. The second person *Sei* may be quasi *Sej*, in which case we should have a compound ^*S=Ej;* and the *E* might be quasi *Ej*. Yet we find, that one ancient mode of representing the three first persons of the Present was *So*, *Se*, and *Ene;* where the *So*, *Se* are used in their uncompounded state, as in the Irish and Galic *Ta*, and the Armoric *So*, which is used in all persons of the Present. We see, that the Armoric and Italian *So* directly coincide with each other; and the *Ene* of the third person will shew us, that the Italian ^*S=Ono*, or SO=^NO, is a compound of the two distinct parts So and Ene, or S^ and ^N^. We have seen, in a former page, that the Gipsey verbs of Being are Se and Shan, which, we perceive, coincide with So, Se, and Sono. I have observed, that the Gipsies are called, in their own Language, *Romani*.

The Gipsey is acknowledged to be an Hindostan Dialect, or a Dialect of the Sanscrit; and the resemblance of the Latin to the Sanscrit has afforded a subject of great astonishment. " It will " perhaps be discovered by some future enquirer," as I have ventured to suggest, " that from a horde of vagrant *Gipsies* once issued " that band of sturdy Robbers, the companions of Romulus and of " Remus, who laid the foundations of the *Eternal City* on the " banks of the Tibur." We now see, that the Italian verb of Being, So, Se, and the Gipsey Se, coincide with each other. It is curious, likewise, that some should have observed the resemblance between the Cloak or Blanket, thrown over the shoulders of the Gipsies, and the *Roman Toga*. I was not aware, that this resemblance had been noticed, when I ventured on the above conjecture. Martinius, under the article *Cingarus*, has the following passage: " Bro- " dæus, lib. 8. Miscellan. cap. 17. ait ipsam *Romanam Togam* " eandem pene cum eâ fuisse, quâ, quos Galli *Bohemos*, Itali *Cin-* " *garos* nominant, amiciuntur." This is, I think, exceedingly impressive

impressive and singular. The mode in which the Gipsies wear the Cloak or Blanket, which is thrown over their shoulders, is certainly unlike any other mode of wearing a similar covering; and the Romans, we all know, were so marked and distinguished from every other people by the dress of their *Toga* or Cloak, that they were called the *Gens* TOGATA:

"*Romanos* rerum dominos, *Gentemque* TOGATAM."

The Spanish verb of Being is composed of the same materials as the Italian verb. The present tense runs thus; *Soi, Eres*, Es, *S=Omos, S=Ois, S=On*; where, in OMOS, OIS, ON, or ^M=^S, ^S, ^N, we have the mode of formation in the ordinary Spanish verbs. We see in *Omos* the Latin form *Umus* in *S=Umus*; though in the second person plural we have the more simple state of the verb of Being. The Spanish Language, as I have observed, exhibits two verbs of Being, or rather two forms of the verb of Being, *Estar*, To be Placed or To Be, and *Ser* To Be, where in *Estar* we see the original idea. The verb of Possession, as I have shewn, appears under the forms ^V, ^B, HAV*ia*, 'I Had;' HUV*e*, I Have Had; HAB=*Riamos*, We could Have. I have shewn, that *Est*-UVE, 'I have been,' is manifestly an inversion of HUVE *Est-Ado*, bearing the same meaning; from which we see, that *Est*=AB^, I was, is a similar composition; and this will unequivocally decide on the origin of the AB and AV in the Latin *Am*=AB=*am*, and *Am*=AV-*i*, namely, that they belong to HAVE, *h*-AB-*eo*, (Lat.) I shall produce the form of two or three tenses in the verb of Being, with the scheme, which appears in the Spanish Grammarians, for forming the first conjugation of the ordinary verbs. This will abundantly shew us the mode in which they are generated, and that they arise from the simpler state of the verb of Being, as we have seen in the Italian, &c. *Er*}*a*, As, *a*, AMOS, AIS, AN; I Was; *Fu*}*i*, ISTE, *e*, IMOS, ISTEIS, ERON, I Was, Have been, &c.; ^S}ER}*e*, As, *a*, EMOS, EIS, AN, I shall be, &c. The same

tenses of *Canto* are thus represented, where the part expressing the verb, as *Cant*, is supposed to precede these terminations; *o*, As, *a*, Amos, Ais, An, (Pres. Tense,) Ab}*a*, As, *a*, Amos, Ais, An, (Preterimp. Tense,) *e*, Aste, *o*, Amos, Asteis, Aron, (Preterperf. Tense,) Ar}*e*, As, *a*, Emos, Eis, An.

In Gothic, the present tense of the verb of Being is Im, Is, Ist, ^*Siy*=Um, ^*Siy*=Uth, ^*S*=Ind; where Im, Is, Ist, Um, Uth, Ind represent the usual form. We perceive that the plural *Siyum*, *Siyuth*, *Sind*, coincide most in form with *Sim*, *Sit*, *Sint*, of the Latin *Sim=Us*, *Sit=Is*, *Sint*. In Saxon, the present tense is Eom, Am, Om, &c. Eart, Ys, for the singular, and ^*S*=Ynd for all the persons in the plural. In Saxon, Si is used for all the persons of the present singular. In English, the persons of the singular agree with the Saxon 'I Am, Thou Art, He Is,' which differ in nothing from the ordinary form, except that in the second person our Element appears fully represented with the R, — Art. In Saxon, Es is sometimes used for *Eart*. In the plural we use Are, and in the past tenses *Were*, or *w*-Ere, which are represented by the Element ^R, as the Er of Er-*am*, Ero. We have seen, that Ero is written Eso, and *Eram*, I imagine, is *Esam*. The English *w*-As, and its corresponding terms *w*-Æs, *w*-As, (Sax. and Gothic,) may create some difficulty. They might belong to our Element ^S, or to the Element BS, BD, which we have seen likewise to denote Being; or the W may belong to the Element B^, F^, &c., and *Æs*, *As*, to ^S. The Plural of the Imperfect *Was*, in Gothic, is *Wesum*, *Wesuth*, *Wesun;* and, in the subjuctive, *Weseima*, *Weseith*, *Weseina;* where the Esum, Esuth, and Esun, and Eseim, Eseith, and Esein, certainly agree with Essem, Esset, Essent, in *Essemus*, *Essetis*, *Essent*. In Saxon we have the Element B^ denoting Existence, as in the English *Be*, To *Be*, Be=*On*. In Saxon, we have both *Be=on* and *Wesan*, Esse, and *Was*, Eram; and thus we might conjecture, that *Wesan* may be quasi *Be*=Es=An, a compound of

of the Elements B^ and ^S. In the singular of the future tense we have *Beo*, *Byst*, *Byth*. In German, this Infinitive Mood has been transferred to the Present, as *Bin*, I am, *B*=IST, IST, Thou Art, He Is, ^*S*=*Ind*, *S*=EYD, ^*S*=IND, We, Ye, They Are. In the first person Plural, we see that the Saxon form is adopted; but in the second we have the regular form of the EYD, belonging to the Element ^T, ^D, &c., and we have the same compound, as in the *S*=IT of *S*=IT-*is*, (Lat.) *Si*=YUTH, (Goth.)

In the Infinitive, the Germans have ^*S*=*Eyn*; and, in the same Language, *W*=ES=EN means "The Being, Ess-ENCE, Substance, "or Nature of any thing," as my Lexicographer explains it, who interprets the phrase, "Das selbst *Standige*, *W*=ES=EN, the Self-"Existing, Self-*Subsisting*, Self-dependent, or Self-Excellent Being "of God;" and *W*=ES=EN by "*Stand*," (Germ.) "*State*, Condition, "Habitude." I have supposed, that the verb of Being, EST, &c, belongs to IST-*emi*, (Ιστημι, Statuo, Ισταμαι, Sto,) or to the idea of that, which is *Placed—Established—Stands* up, &c.; and I have referred it to the same metaphor as that which appears in *Existo—Exist*, &c. Let us mark the words in this explanation of the term for *Being*, drawn from the same metaphor, as *Substance* (from *Sto,) Subsisting*, *Existing*, (from *Sisto,) Stand*, *Standige*, (Germ. from *Sto,) State*, (from *Statuo*, To Place, *Status*, "(1.) A *Standing*.—(6.) *State*,)" &c., as R. Ainsworth explains it.—In English, *B*=*Ist* is used, as in the German and Saxon, and *Bin* is sometimes applied in colloquial Language, as in the German, "Here I *Bin*."—In the *Be*=*En* of the Participle, the *En* is used as the mark of that part of Speech, as in *Se-En*, &c. The ordinary analogy is, that the ^N is used for the Present Participle, as *Be*=*Ing*, *Lov*=*Ing*, &c. &c. We unequivocally observe in these words, *B*=IST, (Eng.) &c., that the IST is added by the analogy in the formation of the verb, and that it does not belong to the Element BD.

The Saxon ordinary verb is formed, as in other instances, of the

the part expressing the sense of the verb, as the Radical, and the verbs of Being, ^S, &c. and ^N. The present tense runs thus; *Luf-*}IGE, AST, ATH, IATH, IATH, IATH. In English, the *Lov*}EST, ETH, or Es, of the second and third persons, agree with the Saxon AST, ATH, and with the familiar analogy in the formation of verbs, ^S, &c. ^S, &c. As, AT, of the Latins, &c. &c. *Am*}As, AT, &c. &c. &c. In the other persons, the simple form of the verb is adopted, I *Love*, We *Love*, &c. In the Saxon Preterite we have *Luf*}ODE, OD=EST, ODE, OD=ON, OD=ON, OD=ON. The *Luf*=ODE of the Saxon, and the *Lov*=ED of the English, (I Lov=ED,) are the participles *Luf*=OD, *Lov*=ED, where the Element ^D ^T appears, as in the Latin *Am*=AT=*Us*. In the second person *Love*=^D=ST, we have the *Luf*-OD=EST of the Saxons. Let us mark, however, in the ON of the Saxon, *Luf-Od*=ON, the ordinary termination of ^N in the third person plural, *Am*=ANT, &c.; though in Saxon it is applied to all the persons. In German the first person of the present tense is *Lobe*, and in the other persons we have *Lob*=}EST, ET, EN, ET, EN, Thou *Lov*=EST, He *Lov*=Es, We, Ye, They Love. In the Imperfect we have *Lob*}ETE, ET=EST ETF, ET=EN, ET=ET, ET=EN. We here observe, that the second person plural ends in ^T, &c., as it commonly does. The past Participle in German is *ge-Lob*=ET, LOV=ED. In Gothic the present tense Sing. and Pl. runs thus; *Sokj-a*, *Sokj*=AIS, *Sok*=EITH, *Sokj*=AM, *Sok*=EITH, *Sokj*=AND, I *seek*, &c. &c. We here see, that, except in the first person singular, the verb is formed by adding to the Radical part, expressing the action of the verb, the verb of Being, &c. under another form. The AIS, EITH, AM, EITH, AND, correspond to Is, IST, UM, UTH, IND, and to the Es, EST, UM, EST, UNT, of the Gothic Is, IST, and *Siy*=UM, *Siy*=UTH, *S*=IND, and of the Latin Es, EST, ^*S*=UM-*us*, EST=*is*, ^*S*=UNT. The Imperfect is thus expressed; *Sok*}IDA, ID=Es, IDA, ID=ED=UM, ID=ED=UTH, ID=ED=UN; where we unequivocally see, that UM, UTH, UN, of the plural, represent the

the Auxiliary. The past or passive participle is *Sok*}IDS or ITHS.

It is curious to observe this marvellous agreement, in the formation of verbs, through various Languages; and if we should select any one portion, as exhibiting the most striking coincidence, we might note the general termination of the third person plural in ^N, ^NT, &c. In the Saxon Language, the plural number of all the tenses terminates in ^N, except in the present tense, where it admits another ending besides N, and the second person plural of the Imperative, in which there is a small variation. In the Gothic the third persons plural of the Indicative terminate in ^ND, and in all other tenses in N^. In the Passive, all the persons plural terminate in ^ND^. In the German the third persons plural of all the tenses have the final ^N. In our old English, as Mr. Tyrwhitt has justly seen, the writers were not agreed among themselves respecting the termination in the plural of the present tense, "some adhering," says he, "to the old Saxon form, *We loveth, ye loveth, they loveth;* "and others adopting, what seems to have been the Teutonic, "*We loven, ye loven, they loven.*" This was equally a Saxon form in the present tense, as Junius observes, "Eædem etiam per- "sonæ," (i.e. personæ plurales præsentis indicativi) "desinunt tam "in *an, en, on, un,* quam in *ath*; ut *Hæbban, Witun, Witath, Scitis,*" &c. &c. With respect to the plural of the past tenses, Mr. Tyrwhitt observes, that *We loveden, ye loveden, they loveden,* universally prevailed. In the present form of the Italian Language, the third persons plural of every tense, except two, terminate in ^N; but in the Spanish Language the same persons *all* terminate in ^N, and in French in ^NT. If we examine the Dialects of the Celtic, we find, according to the arrangement of Lhuyd, that in the "Irish or ancient Scottish "Language," the third person of the present tense terminates in ^N. In the Armoric the third person of the present Indicative ends in ^NT,

^NT, which we see likewise in other tenses; (Lhuyd's Armoric Gram. pages 187-8;) and in the Cornish the general termination for the third person plural is ^NZ. Mr. Lhuyd is aware of the idea, which has passed over many minds, that the verbs have derived their distinction of persons from Pronouns, and he accordingly observes, that the *Anz*, *Onz*, or *Oinz*, the third person plural of Armoric verbs, is the same as the Welsh *Uynt* or *Huint*. I differ only from this idea, by supposing, that the terminations originally performed the part of the verbs of Being, and not that of Pronouns. Yet as the Pronouns and the verbs of Being belong to the same Element, it is not always easy to distinguish between these parts of Speech. The Reader however will, I trust, agree, on a diligent consideration of the question, that I have arranged with due precision the formation of verbs. In the Welsh Dialect we find the ^NT the ordinary termination of the third person plural. In the Persians *all* the third persons plural terminate in ^NT.

The Hebrew Language and its Dialects, the Chaldee, Arabic, Syriac, and Samaritan, follow a different analogy, and cannot, I think, be referred to any of the Languages, which I have before exhibited, in the mode of forming verbs. In these Dialects the distinction of persons is acknowledged to be effected by Pronouns, either prefixed or postfixed, and sometimes both, to the part expressing the action of the verb. The mode of *prefixing* the distinction, which marks tenses and persons, is alone sufficient to separate these Dialects from those Languages, which I have before examined. Yet even in these Dialects the *N* sometimes appears in the third person plural derived from the ^N, employed as the pronoun *They*. In Hebrew the third person plural feminine in one of the three tenses, terminates in ^N^; and there are likewise other persons, marked by this Element. The Reader, who is unacquainted with these Dialects, will perhaps hear with some surprise

surprise of the gender belonging to a verb; yet nothing is more obvious or conceivable. In those forms of Speech, where one part of the verb has arisen from pronouns, we shall not wonder to find, that the pronoun imparts to the compound the distinction of gender which it possessed in its original state. In the Arabic and Chaldee, all the third persons plural feminine terminate in N; and the same ending is likewise to be found in other persons. In the Syriac and Samaritan, among the three tenses belonging to these Dialects, I find in one the termination N attached to the third person plural feminine.

Though the verbs in Hebrew—Arabic, &c. are not formed on the model of those, which we have before examined; they are still formed by the addition of the same Elements. As these Elements unequivocally represent personal Pronouns, and not the verb of Being; the mode of forming such verbs will more properly become the subject of enquiry, when the nature of the Pronouns shall be elucidated. Though I have before produced the Hebrew verb of Being, corresponding with Est, &c., I shall again recall it to the attention of the Reader, in conjunction with other terms which appear to belong to the same train of ideas. In Hebrew, היה HIH, which I imagine to be quasi H*YH*, means "To Be, "Exist," "To Be, Subsist, Remain, Continue." It seems nearly related, says Mr. Parkhurst, to הוא HUH, "To Subside, Subsist, "Exist, Be." Here a difficulty occurs. The Hebrew הוא HUA may be quasi *HVA*, and belong to the Element ᵓV, &c., or it may be derived from היה HIH, under its vowel form. The Hebrew הוא HUA is used as a Verb 'To Be,' and as "a Permanent "Being, one who Subsists, a Person.—He, She, It—That," says Mr. Parkhurst. Here we see, what I suppose in my Hypothesis, where the same word, which denotes *Existence* or *Permanency*, as in a Place, is used in all the relations of *Verb—Participle*, and *Demonstrative Pronoun*, as in *Existit*, and *Existens*. Mr. Parkhurst refers

refers to this word the term יהוה IHUH, JEHOVAH, "the peculiar "and incommunicable name of the Divine *Essence*." The term JEHOVAH has considerable difficulties. It should seem, from hence, that the word was attached to the Element ^V, ^B. We should imagine too, that *Jehovah* belonged to the JOVE—JOV-*is*, the JUP*iter* of the Greeks, as it is commonly understood. One sense of the word היה HIH, is, "To be Heavy," as applied to Sleep; and another, "To be oppressed, depressed, afflicted;" and הוה HUH, (which Mr. Parkhurst places in a separate article from הוא HUA,) means, "To fall down, subside, settle;" from whence, as this writer says, "are derived its two secondary senses of *Sub-* "*sisting*, *Being*, or Continuing, and of *Depressing*, *Oppressing*, or "*Overwhelming*." Here we are brought to the idea of the Low Spot, or *Ground*, on which things *Fall* or *Subside*,—are *Depressed*, &c., whatever may be the Radical to which they belong. While I am examining these words, I cast my eyes upon הזה HZH, which signifies "Sleeping, Sleepy, Drowsy," and which should be referred probably to the same idea as היה HIH, To be Heavy, or Bend down, for Sleep. In this word הזה HZH, we have unequivocally exhibited our Element ^S, &c. Under the word היה HIH, Mr. Parkhurst produces the term יה JH, "as if," says he, "by "abbreviation for יהוה or יהי" IHIH or IHI, "one of the Divine "names, JAH, the *Essence*, *He who* Is, simply, absolutely, and "independently, O ΩN." He afterwards adds, "From this Divine "name יה" JH, "the ancient Greeks had their Ιη, Ιη, in their "invocations of the Gods, particularly of *Apollo*, i. e. *The Light*. "And hence ƎI (written after the Oriental manner from right to "left), afterwards EI, was inscribed over the great door of the "temple of *Apollo*, at *Delphi*." The Delphic EI belongs to these terms denoting Being, and probably was originally meant as the second person of the verb of Being, EI, *Thou Art*.

Mr. Parkhurst derives from the Hebrew היה HUH "the Greek

"Εω,

"Εω, To *Sit*, or *Set*, and Εω, To *Be*." The Greek ΕΙΜΙ, (Ειμι,) is supposed to be derived from this obsolete word *Eo*, (Εω, Inus. Hinc f. Εσομαι, pres. Ειμι.) In Es-*omai*, (Εσομαι,) and other parts of the verb, we see the true form. These vowel verbs in *Eo*, (Εω,) are generally either corruptions from EJ-*o*, or are brought into existence by the Greeks, or supposed to be in existence by their Grammarians, that their futures, in which the Radical form is to be found, may have a Present tense in *Eo*, from which they *ought* to be derived. In *Eo*, Eso, (Εω, Εσω, Colloco,) which relates to *Place*, we see the genuine idea, as supposed in my Hypothesis, from which Es*omai*, (Εσομαι, Ero,) To Be, is derived. Another obsolete word *Eo*, with its attendant Eso, (Εω, Inus. hinc f. Εσω, Induo,) which signifies 'To Put on,' as a Garment, means only, as we now see, 'To *Place* on.' The explanatory word *Put* relates, we know, to *Place*, or Position. There are still two more words under the form *Eo*, from which are supposed to be derived the Greek *Eimi*, (Ειμι, *Eo*,) To Go, and *Iemi*, (Ιημι, Mitto,) To Send. *Eimi* may be quasi EJ-*mi*; but its true form, and that of *Eo*, (Εω,) in Greek, and *Eo*, Latin, signifying To Go, appears in EIS, EISI, &c., (Εις, Εισι, &c.,) ITHI, ITO, &c., (Ιθι, Ιτω, &c.,) and in Is, IT, IT*um*, IT*er*, &c. In the English *Go*, and its parallel terms *Gan*, (Sax.) *Gaen*, (Belg.) *Gehen*, (Germ.) and the Greek *Kio*, (Κιω, Eo,) produced by the Etymologists, the breathing before the Radical ^T^, ^G^ is lost, and retained after it, as T ^, G ^, &c. The *N* in the parallel terms GA-*n*, GA-*en*, is only the representation of the Infinitive, from which *Gang*, To *Gang* about, is derived. *Gang*, the company, signifies Persons collected in the same *Gang* or Ways; 'They are all of 'the same *Gang*, they all follow the same Ways;' 'They all *Gang* 'or *Go* together.' In ^GE, ^GEA, ^GAIA, (Γη, Γεα, Γαια, Terra,) and in the Irish CE, the *Earth*, the breathing is likewise lost before, and retained after the Radical Consonant. In the Hindostan Dia-

lects, Jaou-*Na* is To Go, where the *Na* is the mark of the Infinitive, as in the other verbs; "*Sauheb* kay pauss Jaou, Go to "(near to,) Master," as Mr. Hadley explains it. (Gram. p. 24.) The particles for the Genitive and Dative in these Dialects are Kau, of, Kay, and Ko, *To;* which all signify the same as the English *To*, and were originally applied to *Place*. Our particle To belongs to the same idea. The true form of *Iemi*, (Ιημι, Mitto,) appears in Ies, Iesi, &c. (Ιης, Ιησι, &c.) Iethi, Ieto, &c. Es, Eto, &c. (Ιεθι, Ιετω, &c. Ες, Ετω, &c.) Eso, Eka, (Ησω, f. Ηκα, perf.); and its sense of *Sending* here and there is derived from the idea of Causing to *Go* here and there. *Iemai*, (Ιεμαι, Eo cum impetu, Ιεμαι, Cupio, desidero,) signifies to *Go* forward with some violence, and To Desire, from the idea of *Going* after any thing with ardor. In the same column with Iemi, (Ιημι,) and Ithi, (Ιθι, Age, Agedum, Imp. ab Ειμι,) *Go* on, *Go* forward, Ith*ma*, (Ιθμα, Gressus, Passus,) a Step, &c., I find Ith*us*, (Ιθυς, Rectus, directus,) which means nothing but *Going* or Proceeding forward in a right line, or Straight Path. In the verb Ith*uo*, (Ιθυω, Recta feror,—Impetu feror,—Desiderio alicujus rei feror seu agor,) we have a similar union of ideas of *Going* forward with some violence, and of Desire. In the same opening of my Greek Vocabulary are Ik*neomai*, (Ικνεομαι, Venio,) Iko, (Ικω, Venio,) which will remind us of Eko, (Ηκω, Venio,) terms all relating to the same action of *Going*, and all naturally derived from the same Spot, the Earth, or Eath, &c. &c. In the same opening we have Ik*ano*, (Ικανω, Convenio, adeo, adsequor, supplico,) which the Lexicographers refer to Eko, (Ηκω, Venio); and perhaps Ik*eteuo*, (Ικετευω, Supplico,) may be derived from the same idea of *Approaching*. We have seen Erch=*omai*, (Ερχομαι, Venio,) where we have the form ʿRC.

Let us now return to the verbs denoting *Being*—or *Existence* in Hebrew. Whatever we may think of the Hebrew היה HIH, whether it be quasi HJH, and belongs to our Element ʿJ, ʿS, &c.,

we

we see the Is and the Est, &c. &c. of the English, Latins, &c. &c., most unequivocally, in another Hebrew term ישׁ ISH, which I have before produced, and which means, says Mr. Parkhurst, "Ex- "istence, Subsistence, Reality." As a verb, יש IS signifies "Is, Are, "Was, Were;"—As a noun, "Substance, Reality, the true riches;" "As a N. with a formative, איש, fem. אשׁה," (A, AIS, fem. ASH,) "dropping the ', " I, "A *Being*, or *thing Subsisting* or *Existing*. "This word has no relation to *kind* or *species*, though, according "to its different genders, it has to *Sex*, but is applied to almost "any distinct *Being* or *Thing*.—It may be and frequently is "rendered *Each*, Every one." In the Hebrew ישׁ ISH, we see the ideas, which I have supposed in my hypothesis. One sense of this Hebrew word, when doubled, ישׁישׁ ISIS, is that of "Very old or "ancient, very far advanced in years, one who has been or lived "a great while." I have shewn, that a race of words relating to Time, as Age, *Ætas*, *Æternus*, has been derived from the idea of that, which has *Subsisted*,—*Existed*,—*Stood*,—*Remained*, *Lasted*, *Endured*, &c.; and here we see the same union of ideas between Age and *Subsistence*. We talk of a Place or Person of some *Standing*.

Mr. Parkhurst has seen, that Is, Yes in English belong to this Hebrew word; and he adds, "Also perhaps the Saxon Is, or Iss, "when English Ise, or Ice." The English Ice and its parallel terms may be derived from the idea of *Substance*, *Consistence*, or *Solidity*; and, if it is derived from hence, it must be classed with this family of words. It might belong, however, to the terms denoting *Water*, as Aqua, &c., which I produce in another place. The term Ice and its parallels *Is*, *Isa*, (Sax.) *Eise*, (Belg.) *Eisz*, (Germ.) &c. may remind us of *Iron*, which under some forms becomes *Iiser*, (Belg.) *Eysen*, (Germ.); and this word might properly be derived from the idea of *Solidity—Firmness*. Horace employs the very same metaphor of *Consistency* in describing the operation of Frost, as we all remember, "Geluque Flumina *Constiterint* acuto;" and the Saxon

Saxon Is, Ice, succeeds in my Saxon Dictionary Is, denoting *Is* or *Est.* In the succeeding column we have Is*en*, Ferrum. In the same column of Mr. Parkhurst's Lexicon, where ישׁה ISH occurs, we have ישׁם ISM, To "Place, Set, Put;" where the Is has the same idea of *Place* or *Position* as in ישׁה ISA, To *Exist*, and likewise ישׁן ISN "To Sleep, be in a sound sleep," which means nothing but to be *Placed* or *Laid* down. This will be manifest by another sense of the word "*Laid up in store*," says Mr. Parkhurst, "*Laid* "*by* or *asleep*, as it were, i. e. in *a quiet undisturbed state.*" In both these senses it might be explained by *Reposed*, Laid in *Repose*, or Laid in a *Repository*, or again, by the same metaphor, *Deposited*, as in a safe *Place* or *Position*. The SM in *Ishem* ישׁם belongs to שׁם SM, "To Place, Set, Put;" and ישׁן belongs to אדן ADN, from דן DN, the Base, the Stand, &c. &c., which I have discussed on another occasion. The explanatory word *Down* I have shewn to belong to דן DN, the Base.

As I have now detailed all which I think necessary to be observed on the Verbs of Being, belonging to our Element, as they appear in various Languages; I shall next proceed to another portion of my work, and examine the *Pronouns*, which belong to the same Element, and which I consider to be only different forms of these verbs, discharging different offices. On the most careful review of the analysis, which has been exhibited, respecting the composition of verbs; I have unfolded, as I conceive, the true state of the question. Still, however, I must again repeat, (see page 295,) that it is often difficult to decide in every particular instance, whether the Inflexion of the verb should be considered as a Verbal or Pronominal addition. On some occasions, this point cannot be decided, and in others, an attempt at a distinction of such a kind, in discussions on Elementary Speech, would be idle and unmeaning. My object is to prove, that the verbs of Being and the *Pronouns*, belonging to our Element,

Element, are all connected with each other; and that the Inflexions of verbs, in various Languages, are derived from this source.—I have endeavoured likewise to discover, to what part of Speech the Inflexion in its primitive state should be considered, as more particularly and properly attached; and in the course of this enquiry, I have performed, as I trust, all which the nature of the question would admit, without falling into the opposite errors of confounding what is capable of distinction, or of separating what cannot be distinguished.

Pronouns *belonging to our Element* ^*C*, ^*D*, *&c.*, *C*^, *D*^, *&c.*, *with or without a vowel breathing before the C, &c., which denoted, originally, the* Existing *being or thing*—This *or* That Existing *being or thing*—This, That, *&c.; as* Iste, Is, Hic, *(Lat.)* It, *(Lat.) &c. &c.*

Pronouns with the Vowel breathing before the ^C, ^D, &c.

1. Iste, Hic, Is, Id, (Lat.) &c., Out=*os*, Aut=*os*; Os, (Gr.) &c. &c. &c.
2. It, (Eng.) with its parallel terms Ita, Es, Hit, &c. (Goth. Germ. Sax.) His, (Eng.), &c. &c.
3. Words for One, as Eis, (Εἰς,) with its parallels Eek, (Pers.) &c. &c.
4. Ego, (Lat.) with the parallel terms Egoo. (Gr.) Ich, (Germ.) &c. &c.

&c. &c. &c.

Pronouns with the Vowel breathing after the C^, D^, &c.

1. Thou and its parallel terms Su, (Gr.) Tu, (Lat.) &c. &c.
2. The Relative Qui and its parallels Che, Que, (Ital. Span. and Fr.) *Who* quasi *Qwho*, &c.
3. The, (Eng.) and its parallels Se, Tha, Die, &c. (Sax. Germ.) To, (Gr.) &c. &c. &c.
4. She with its parallels Si, Seo, (Goth. Sax.) &c.
5. Other Pronouns, Se (Lat. Fr. Ital. Span.) Self,—Ce, Cio, (Fr. Ital.) &c.

&c. &c. &c.

In the former article, I considered the verbs of Being or Existence, belonging to the Element ^C, ^D, ^G, &c., as Est, (Lat.) Is, (Eng.) &c. &c., which I have shewn to be derived from the idea of that, which is *Placed—Situated*, *Stands* up, &c., and to belong to such terms as Ist-*emi*, (Ιστημι, Colloco, Statuo;—at in aor. 2. perf. plusq. perf. *Sto*, Consisto; unde *Est*;—*Esse*, &c.) Est-*ar*, (Span.) To be in a place, To Be, &c. &c., all which I have ultimately referred to Est*ia*, (Εστια, Vesta Dea,) the Earth, &c. &c. This is the same metaphor, as I have before observed, which belongs to the explanatory term *Existence*, from *Sisto*, "To *Set*, or to be made to *Stand*." I shall consider in this article the *Pronouns—Articles—Demonstrative adjectives*, &c. &c., which are attached to the same Element ^C, ^D, ^G, &c., such as Is, Id, Hic, Iste, (Lat.) It, (Eng.) &c. &c., which are only, as I conceive, different forms of the verbs of Being, Est, (Lat.) Is, (Eng.) &c. &c. applied to different purposes. Thus Iste and Est originally belonged to each other, just as *Existens* belongs to *Existit*, or *Positus* to *Ponitur*; so that Iste has the same sense as Iste=*Ens* or Est=*Ens* might have had, as participles from Est. From the idea of the *Existing* person or thing, which Is, Id, Hic, (Lat.) originally bore, we directly pass into the sense of *This* or *That*—Existing, person or thing, by way of distinction, or *This—That* in general. We shall find, that the Elements ^M, &c., ^N, &c., and ^R, contribute their share likewise in the formation of Pronouns, as we have seen in the Verbs of Being; and we shall perceive, that these Pronouns and Verbs are only different forms of each other, applied to different purposes. All these Elements ^C, &c., ^M, &c., ^N, &c., supply Pronouns of every person, and of every description. The vowel breathing attached to these Elementary Consonants sometimes precedes, and sometimes follows, as we have seen in the verbs.—I have shewn, that the familiar Verbs of Being

are

are often compounds from more simple forms, and that the inflexions of the ordinary verbs are derived from these simpler forms.—I shall shew, in this article, that many of the familiar Pronouns are likewise compounds from Pronouns under a simpler form; and that the inflexions of Substantives and Adjectives are derived from these forms.—The order, which I shall adopt in this enquiry, will be such, as I conceive to be best suited to the elucidation of the question; and I shall not scruple to introduce other parts of the argument, which directly connect themselves with the objects before me.

I shall first produce, under one view, the more familiar *Pronouns—Articles—Demonstrative adjectives*, &c. &c., in various Languages, under the form of the Element ^C, ^D, ^G, &c., with the breathing before the Radical Consonant, and sometimes likewise after it, which denote the *Existing* Person or Thing—*This* or *That*—*Existing* Person or Thing, &c. &c. Under this form we may enumerate the following terms: Iste, Hic, Is, Id, &c., (Lat.) Out-*os*, Aut-*os*, Os, Os or Eos, Ek=Ast-*os* Ek=*Ein-os*, &c. &c., (Gr. Ουτος, *Hic*, Αυτος, Ille, Ος, Qui, Ος, Εος, Suus, Εκαστος, Unus quisque, Εκεινος, Ille,) the English It, with the parallel terms produced by the Etymologists, as Ita, Es, Hit, Hitt, Het, (Goth. Germ. Sax. Run. and Dan. Belg.) At, (Scotch) That which, Et=*Was*, (Germ.) Some thing, Hig, (Sax.) They, Them, His, (Eng.) Is, Eis, and Ije, Ize, (Goth.) He or of him—*It*, They, Who, and of Them, Ixe, Ego, (Russ.) Them, Of Him, &c. Esso, (Ital.) Esse, Este, (Span.) This, That, Ash, Esh-*an*, (Pers.) *Its*, *His* or Hers, Ise, Idse or Iad, Ud or Od, (Gal.) He or She, They, That; Isa, Iad, (Gal.) He, They, Eiddo, (Welsh) One's own; Haza, (Ar. هٰذَا) This, That, At, (Heb. את) That, The; Ais, Ash, (Heb. איש, אשה) Every one, Any, Man, Woman, Ash-^*r*, (Heb. אשר) Who, Which, &c. &c.

2dly, The words we must add to the terms denoting the numeral

One.

One in various Languages, as Eis, Eek, Yek, Ek, Ahd, Achd, ^Chd, Hd, Houit, Houid, Od=*Ene*, &c. &c., (Gr. Pers. Gips. Hind. Arab. Heb. and Æthiop. Chald. Syr. Coptic, Sahidic, Russian, &c.) To the above terms, which familiarly express the numeral *One*, in the series of Cardinal numbers, we may add these, which denote a *Single, Peculiar*, person or thing, as the English Ace and Odd, and the Greek Ios, Oios, Id-*ios*, (Ιος, Solus, Unus, Οιος, Solus, Ιδιος, Peculiaris, Sui generis, Suus, Privatus); to the latter of which belongs, we know, *Ideot*, *Idiotes*, (Ιδιωτης, Privatus, Plebeius.) The parallel terms to *Ace*, as produced by the Etymologists, are *As*, (Fr. and Span.) *Asso*, (Ital.) *Ess*, (Germ.) *Esz*, (Dan.) *Aes*, (Belg.); and Junius observes, that these words "præ se ferunt vestigium Græci Εις, Unus." The parallel terms, which they produce for Odd, are *Oed*, *Ood*, (Belg.) *Oed*, *Ode*, *Od*, (Teut.) *Udda*, (Swed.)

3dly, Words, denoting other persons, besides the third, as Ego, (Lat.) with its parallel terms, Egoo, Ic, Eg, Jeg, Ich, Ick, (Gr. Εγω, Sax. Run. Dan. Germ. Belg.) *I*, *Io*, *Yo*, *Je*, (Eng. Ital. Span. Fr.) Ati, (Heb.) &c., At, (Heb.) Thou; Euch, (Germ.) You, &c. &c. In some of these, as we perceive, the breathing before the Radical has disappeared. Whenever different forms presenting the same idea occur, I insert the words under the forms less familiar among these terms, which compose the more common form. The above words under the form, with the vowel breathing before the Radical Consonants ^C, ^D, ^G, &c., agree with the form of the verbs of Being, which I have before produced, as Is, Est, Esti, Es, Ess-*er*, Is, Ist, Ast, Este, Is, Ata, As, Is, Ata, Is, Oes, Ez, Ysy, Otte, Ydzhi, Ez, &c. (Eng. Lat. and Fr. Gr. Span. Ital. Sax. and Belg. Goth. and Germ. Pers. Russ. Heb. Irish, Galic, Welsh, Cornish, and Armoric.)

We have seen, likewise, that when the breathing before the C^, D^, G^, &c. is lost, and is preserved after it, we have the verbs of Being under the form Ta, Si, So-Se, Se, &c. (Irish and Galic, Welsh, Old Italian, Gipsey, &c.) We shall find a great race of words, performing the part of Pronouns, &c. under this form, among which we may enumerate the following: 1st, The English Thou, Thee or Thy, with its parallel terms, Su, Se, Soi, Tu, Te, Toi, &c. (Gr. Συ, Σε, Σοι, Τυ, Τε, Τοι, Dor.) Tu, Te, (Lat.) Tu, Te, Toi, (Fr.) Tu, Te, Ti, (Ital. and Span.) Thu, (Goth. Sax. Isl.) Du, (Dan. Belg. Swed. and Germ.) To, (Pers.) Toui, (Russ.) Ti, Tau, Dy, (Welsh,) Tu, (Ir. and Gal.) Ty, Te, Da, Dhy, The, (Corn.) Te, Da, *Az*, (Arm.) Too, Ta, (Hind.) Ta, Ka, (Heb.) Ka, *At, Ik, Iki*, (Chald.) Ka, Ki, (Ar.) Ge, Gu-^*S*, Chwi, Chui, Chui and *Hui*, (Sax. Goth. Welsh, Arm. Corn.) *Ye* or *You*, quasi Je, Ge, Jou, Gou. In Hebrew, likewise, *Ata, At* mean *Thou;* in Armoric, *Az* means *Thee;* and in German, *Euch* means *You;* and in Welsh, *Eich* is *Your.* In Gothic, *You* in some of the oblique cases is Izweis; and in Spanish, *Os* is You.

2dly, The Relative Qui, Quæ, Qu=*Od*, &c., Cui, (Lat.) and its parallel terms, performing the same office, as Chi, Che, Cui, (Ital.) Que, Cuyo, (Span.) Qui, Que, Quoi, (Fr.) Cia, Ce, Se, (Ir.) Co, Cia, Ci=*Od*, (Gal.) Jo, Keea, Kai, Ki=*S*, (Hind.) Koi, Kto, Tchto, Tchei, (Russ.) Keh, Ki, Cheh, Chi, (Pers.) Se, Seo, (Sax.) Sa, So} *Ei*, (Goth.) We must add to these, *Who, Wha*=^*T*, (Eng.) and its parallel terms *Hwa, Hwæ=T*, (Sax.) *Hwa, Hwa*=^*S*, (Goth.) *We*=^*R*, *Wa*=^*S*, (Germ.) quasi Qwho, Qwha=^*T*, &c. &c., Qway, (Scotch.)

3dly, The, (Eng.) the article, with its parallel terms, Se, Seo, Tha, (Sax.) Sa, So, Thai, (Goth.) To, (Gr. Το,) Die, (Germ.) De, (Belgic,) &c. &c. &c.

4thly,

4thly, SHE with its parallel terms, as produced by the Etymologists, SI, (Goth.) SCHE, SCÆ, (A. N.) SEO, (Sax.) SIE, (Germ.) SII, (Belg.) SI, (Ir.)

5thly, Others, Pronouns, &c. &c., as SE, SUI, (Lat.) SE, SOI, (Fr.) SE, SI, (Ital. Span.) SI=^*S*, SI=*Ch*, (Sax. Germ.) &c. &c. denoting Self; SIE, (Germ.) They; JE, (Germ.) The, as in JE=*Der*, Every one; CE, CIO, (Fr. Ital.) That; CEI, (Russ.) That; GY, DZHEI, DHI, DHO, DHE, (Corn.) They, Them, Her, It, Him; SE, TI, (Gal.) This, He who; SE, SA, SI, SO, TI, (Ir.) He and Self, His, Hers, Theirs, This, That; CIA, (Irish,) Man; DI, (Chald. Samar. and Syr.) He who; TI, (Gr. Τι,) That, Such a thing; SA, So, KI, (Gips.) How, What, Where; KOEE, JO=KOEE, (Hind.) Any One, Every One; ZH, ZO, CH, CI, S^, (Heb. ש כי כה זו זה) This, That, &c., Who, Which, &c.; ZA, TA, (Ar. ذا تا) This, That, &c. &c. &c.

I shall now give a general view of the Pronouns, which appear attached to the Labial Consonants, ^B, ^F, ^P, ^V, ^M, with the breathing, in its three different positions, before or after, or both before and after, these Radical Labial Consonants. 1st, ME and MY, with their parallel terms, *Eme*, *Me*, *Moi*, *Eem-eis*, (Gr. Εμε, Με, Μοι, Ημεις,) Me, We; *Me*, &c. (Lat.) *Me*, *Moi*, (Fr.) *Me*, *Mi*, (Ital. and Span.) *Me=Ina*, *Mi=^S*, (Goth.) *Me*, *Mi=^N*, (Sax.) *Me=Iner*, *Mi=^Ch*, (Germ.) *Me=^Nia*, *Mai*, (Russ.) Of Me, We, &c.; *Ma=^N*, *Ma=ra*, *Ma*, *Am*, (Pers.) I, To Me, We, My; *Mi*, *Fi*, (Welsh,) *Me*, *Om*, (Gal. and Ir.) *Mi*, *Ma*, *Am*, (Arm.) *Mi*, *Me*, *Vi*, *Evi*, *Am*. (Corn.) *My*, *May*, *Hum*. (Hind.) *We*, *We=is*, *Wi=r*, (Eng. and Sax. Goth. Germ.) *Wi=t*, (Goth. and Sax.) We two, &c.

2dly, The English HIM, with its parallels *Him*, and *Imma*, (Sax. and Goth.) signifying To that Person and thing, To them; *Im*, (Goth.) To them; *Ihm*, (Germ.) *Hem*, (Belg.) *Eum*, *Eam*, (Lat.) *Em*, *Th-^Em*, (Eng.) &c.

3dly,

3dly, *Efe, Ef, Efo, Fe, Fo,* (Welsh,) He; *Ip-se,* (Lat.) *Mia,* (Gr. Μια,) One; *N=Ep, N=Eb,* (Welsh,) Who, He that; *Aup,* (Hind.) Self; *Hem,* (Cornish,) *Hem,* (Heb. and Arab.) They; *Um=Eis, Bai, Voi, Vi, V=os, V=Ous,* &c. (Gr. Russ. Ital. Lat. Span. Fr.) You; *Ma, M^=En,* (Ar.) That which, He who, &c. The words under this form coincide with the names for Father and Mother in various Languages, *Am, Ab, Abu, Bu, Ma, Pa,* &c. &c., and with the verbs of Being, which I have produced above, and which we have seen in so many Languages, as *Am, Be,* (Eng.) *Eimi,* (Ειμι,) *Um* in *s=Um,* (Lat.) *Am,* (Pers.) *Im,* (Ir.) *Wf, Mae,* (Welsh,) *Ov, Av, Am, Ma,* (Corn.) *Hoova,* (Hind.) &c. &c. &c. In Welsh, *Pwy, Pa,* in Armoric, *Pe, Piou, Pe=^T, Pe=Hez, Pe=Hini,* in Cornish, *Piua, Pa,* mean Who, What, &c. These may belong to the Element Q^, as in the Latin Qui, &c., just as we have seen *Who, Wha=^T,* to be quasi QWHO, QWHA=^T. The Greek Poι, (Ποι, Quo, Quonam, Quorsum,) in Poι-*os*, *o*Poι-*os*, (Ποιος, Qualis, Οποιος, Qualis,) &c., certainly belongs to these Celtic terms Pa, &c.; and in some Dialects we know, that *o*Koι-*os*, (Οκοιος, Ion. pro Οποιος,) is written, where Koι coincides with the form Que, &c.

The Element ^N, ^NT, &c. &c. supplies a race of Pronouns, Demonstrative Adjectives, &c. &c. through a great variety of Languages; among which we may enumerate the following: 1st, The English Article *An,* with its parallel terms *An,* (Sax. Ir. Gal. and Arm.) *Un,* (Corn.) &c. 2dly, *Hins, Hine, Ina,* (Goth. Sax. and Goth.) He, Him; *Ins,* (Goth.) Them; *j-Ains,* (Goth.) He; *y-On, Any,* (Eng.) *Ihn, Ihn*-en, *j-Ene,* (Germ.) Him, Them, That; *Ain, An,* (Pers.) This, That; *One, Oni,* (Russ.) He, They; *On, En, D'-Ont,* (Fr.) Some, a Person, Them, &c.; ^*Ne,* (Ital.) Them; *Hwn, Hon, Hwnnw, Honno, Hynny, Hwynt,* &c. (Welsh,) This, That, They, Them, &c. &c.; *En,* (Arm.) He; *Hen, Honan, Honyn,* (Corn.) That, Self; *An,* (Gal.) Them; *Hen,* (Heb. and Arab.) They;

Enth-op,

Enth-op, (Copt.) He; *Anda*, (Cyprian. Ανδα, αυτη. Κυπριοι, Hesych.) She; *Ans*, *Ansa*, *Enu*, *Ena*, *Enh*, (Syr.) A Man, Such a Person, He, &c.; *Anun*, &c. (Syr. and Chald.) They; *Enioi*, *Oon*, *On*, *Ens*, (Gr. and Lat. Ενιοι, Ων, Ον,) Some, This or That Existing Person or Thing. 3dly, Certain Pronouns denoting the first Person singular and plural; *Unc*, *Unge*, (Sax.) To Us two; *Uns*, (Goth. and Germ.) Us; *Inn*, (Ir.) We; *In*, &c. (Ir.) We, Us, (as in *S=Inn*, We, *Dhu-In*, To Us, &c. *Ua-In*, from Us); *Hon*, *Ni*, (Arm.) Us, We; *Yn*, &c., *Nei*, *Ni*, (Corn.) Us, (as in *Dh=Yn*, To us,) We; *Ani* or *Anki*, *Anu*, *Anchnu*, *Nachnu*, *Ni*, *Nu*, (Heb.) I, We, Me, Us; *Noi*, *Ne*, (Ital.) We, Us; *No-^s*, *No-Us*, (Lat. Span. Fr.)

In Gothic, *Ugkis* means To us two; where we may see how the forms ^N and ^G might pass into each other. Whatever may have been the fact, as to the original state of these Pronouns, we may observe, that when these forms once existed, they would constitute classes of words, which may be considered as separate from each other. The English and Saxon *Us* seems to be directly taken from the form *Uns*. In Italian, *Ci* and *Ce* is Us. The second Person is sometimes expressed by the form ^N, as in *Inc*, (Sax.) To You Two; and in Gothic we have the equivocal form *Igqis*. — *Ant*, *Ant-ok*, *Enth-ok*, *Ent-ok*, (Arab. Syr. Chald. Cop. and Sahid.) signify Thou.

4thly, The Numeral expressing *One*, which belongs to the Element ^N in so many Languages, as *One*, *En*, (Εν,) *Un-us*, *An*, *Ains*, *Aina*, *An*, *Ein*, *Een*, *Un*, *Uno*, *Aon*, *Un*, *Uyn-yn*, *Un-an*, &c. (Eng. Gr. Lat. Goth. Sax. Germ. Belg. Fr. Ital. and Span. Ir. and Gal. Welsh, Corn. Arm. &c.)—I have before produced various terms under this form denoting Being, as *An-er*, *And-r-os*, *Anth-r-op-os*, *An-ax*, (Ανηρ, Ανδρος, Ανθρωπος, Αναξ,) *Hine*, *Hind*, (Eng.) *Ans*. (Heb. Arab. Chald. Syr.) Man, &c.; *Antta*, *Ansa*, *Aindear*, (Syr. Ar. Irish,) A Woman, &c.; *Aunt*, *Uncle*, *Av-Unculus*, (Eng. Lat.) &c. &c., and the verbs of Being, *Einai*, *Een*, *Enti*, (Gr.

(Gr. Ειναι, Ην, Εντι, Esse, Eram, Sunt,) *Unt*, in the compound *S=Unt*, *An*, (Gal. and Irish,) *Wn*, *Ynt*, (Welsh,) *Oni*, *Onz*, (Corn.) *Oun*, *Int*, (Arm.) *Hyn*, (Hind.) *And*, (Pers.) *Ani*, (Syr.) &c. &c. &c.

The Element ^R sometimes appears among the Pronouns, as in *Her*, with its parallel terms *Hire*, *Ihr*, (Sax. Germ.) *Your* and *Our*, (Eng.) *Eower*, *Euer*, *Ihr*, (Sax. Germ.) Of You, You; *Ure*, *Ar*, *Hor*, (Sax. Gal. and Ir. Arm.) Of Us; *Hira*, *Heora*, (Sax.) Of Them; *Ihr*, (Germ.) Their, &c.; *Er*, (Germ.) He; *D^=Er*, *W=Ir*, *W=Er*, (Germ.) The, We, Who; *Yr*, *Ar*, (Welsh, Arm.) the Article The; Er, Or, (Eng. Lat. &c. &c.) a termination denoting Being, as in *Sing*-Er, *Cantat*=Or, &c. &c. &c. The Pronoun sometimes appears without a Consonant, under the form of a vowel breathing, as *He*, (Eng. and Sax.) *Heo*, *Hi*, (Sax.) She, They; *I*, (Gal.) He or She, &c. These are generally, I imagine, derived from the Consonant form; and sometimes, perhaps, they appear under their original representation. The Element ^L is sometimes found among the Pronouns, or Demonstrative adjectives; and to this we must refer the Articles and Pronouns, in the Arabic, Italian, Spanish, and French Languages, as *Al*, (Ar. ال) *Il*, *Egli*, *Ella*, *Lo*, *La*, &c. (Ital.) *El*, *Lo*, *Ella*, &c. (Span.) *Il*, *Le*, *La*, *Lui*, (French,) *Ille*, (Lat.) &c. The *g*, in the Italian *Egli*, is an organical addition to the L.

These observations will sufficiently unfold to us the original materials, of which the Pronouns, &c. in various Languages consist. I shall now consider the mode, in which they have been compounded, and the purposes, to which they have been applied in the formation of Languages, distinguished by inflexions of the Nouns. Though our Element ^C^, ^D^, &c. constitutes the main subject of my Enquiry, I shall perpetually recur to the other Elements, as they are connected with that, which is the object of my

my discussion in the formation of Pronouns. We shall marvel to observe, how these Elements in their simple state have been compounded with each other, and how the form of inflexions has been assumed from this composition. Though I had always suspected, that this species of combination existed in various instances, where it was little supposed to be found; I had still no conception of the extent, to which it has operated, till I had fully entered into the subject, and was engaged in writing these discussions.

I shall first briefly consider the composition of some Latin and Greek Pronouns, as compared with others. In the Russian Dialect of the Sclavonic, we find, that in all the five Declensions, the plural Instrumental case, as it is called, has ^M in the last syllable, as *Rouka*, The Hand, *Rouk*=AMI, With the Hands, &c. &c. It is often so likewise in the Dative plural, as *Iacor*=IAME, To the Anchors, &c. &c., and sometimes in the Instrumental Singular, as *Lits*=EME, With the Countenance, &c. &c. We find likewise ^B, or ^V, as a termination, as *Zmai*}EBE, IAME, EBE, mean Of, To, The Serpents, (Gen. Dat. Accus.) In the Pronouns we have *T*=EBAI and *S*=EBAI, corresponding with the Latin *T*=IBI, and *S*=IBI, *Nace*, of *Us;* or *Us* in the Accusative, corresponding with *Nos*, (Lat.) and *N*=AME, To Us, *Vai*, Ye, *Vace*, Of You, You, and *V*=AME, To You. The Russian Pronoun, denoting *He*, is, according to the arrangement of the Grammarians, thus declined in the Masculine Singular: N. *One*, G. *Ego*, D. *Emou*, A. *Ego*, *Ime*, Avec lui.—*On-Eme*, De lui. My Grammarian thus explains the use of these two last cases, to which he has given the names of Instrumental and Præpositive. In the plural we have for all genders, N. *Oni*, Eux, *Onai*, Elles, G. *Ixe*, D. *Ime*, A. *Ixe*.—*Ime*, Avec Eux.—*On*=*Ixe*, D'Eux. The Russian Scholar understands, I imagine, that the Inflexions of his Adjectives and Pronouns are formed from this Demonstrative Pronoun. Thus, G. *Dobr*-AGO, D. *Dobr*-OMOU, A. *Dobr*-AGO, are

G. *Dobr*-

G. *Dobr*-Ego, D. *Dobr*-Emou, A. *Dobr*-Ego, &c. Thus, *N*^=Ace, of Us, is quasi *N*^=Ixe; and *V*=Ace, of You, You, is quasi *V*=Ixe.

We shall now understand, that the Latin *N*=Os, *V*^=Os, and their parallels *Nous*, *Vous*, (Fr.) &c. &c., are compounds of the ^N^ and ^B^, denoting Being, and our Element ^S, performing the part of Inflexion, though originally significant. The plural of the Pronoun of the first person has been often, as we have seen, expressed by the Element ^N, as Anu, Unc, Uns, Inn, (Heb. Sax. Goth. and Germ. Ir.) &c. &c.; and when the breathing is lost before the N^, and is preserved after it, we have Noi, No, (Νωι, Νω,) Noi, Ne, (Ital.) Ni, Nei, (Heb. and Arm Corn.) &c. &c. &c.; and to these the N^ in *N*^=*Os* belongs. In *V*=*Os* we have a similar union of V^, signifying You, and corresponding with Bai, (Russ.) Voi, (Ital.) and *Os* the termination. The English and Saxon We belong to the Element V^, B^, denoting the first person plural. In Gothic we have ^W^=*Eis*, and in German *W*^=*Ir*, which are compounds of the part *W*^, expressing the Pronoun, and the termination. It is curious to observe, how widely extended the termination of ^S, ^C, ^T, &c. has been in expressing the plural of Pronouns, as in *N*=Os, *V*=Os, with their acknowledged parallels, *No*=Us, *Vo*=Us, &c., the Russian N^, V^} Ace, We, You; the Saxon-Gothic, and the Gothic *W*^} It, Eis, We two, We; the Saxon *G*=Yt, You two; the Gothic *G*=It, and *Ig*=Wis, *J*=Us, *Iz*=Wis, You two, You; and the Greek *Eem*, *Um*, *Sph*} Eis, (Ημεις, Υμεις, Σφεις,) We, Ye, They. We shall in vain endeavour to discover that peculiar example, in which this addition was originally significant, or the precise meaning of the addition, when it was first annexed.—In Spanish, Os signifies *You;* and we have seen the plural of the second person expressed in other instances by a breathing before the Element ^C, ^S, &c., as *Euch*, (Germ.) &c. This might lead us to conclude, that *V*^=Os was a compound of V^ and Os, both signifying the same thing. We must observe, however, that the

Os

Os in *N*=Os and *V*=Os seems to be formed from the same analogy, as it appears from the parallel terms in Russian. The Spanish OS may either belong to the words with a similar meaning, Euch, &c., unconnected with *Vos*, or it may be derived by corruption from *v*-OS.

Formation of the Saxon, Greek, and Latin Articles, &c.—Inflexions of Nouns in certain Languages from Pronominal or Articular Suffixes.—The Inflexions of Saxon, Gothic, and Latin Nouns, &c. Observations on the Inflexions of Nouns in the Russian Dialect of the Sclavonic.—Some English terminations considered, &c. &c.

The English Article THE first presents itself to our attention. Skinner refers it to the German *Die*, the Belgic *De*, and the Greek *O*, *Ee*, *To*, (Ο, η, το); and he adds, that Junius derives the Belgic *De* from the Greek Δεινα. He should have observed, too, that all these belong to the Saxon *Se*, *Seo*, sometimes *Thy*, *The*, and the Gothic *Sa*, *So*. It is marvellous, that the form of the article, beginning with S^, should have concealed this relation from the eyes of our Etymologist, especially as in other parts of the article the letter *T* is found. In Greek the form of S, as *Se*, *So*, sometimes appears likewise, as in *Semeron*, *Setes*, (Σημερον, Hodie, Σητες, Hoc Anno,) which are written *Temeron*, *Tetes*, (Τημερον, Τητες.) The Saxon and Gothic articles are compounds in most of their parts, and I shall write them at full length according to the mode, in which, as I conceive, they have been formed. N. Sing. Se, Seo, Th^=*At*. (G.) Sa, So, Th^=*Ata*, (Masc. Fem. Neut.) Gen. Th^=*Æs*, Th^=*Ære*, Th^=*Is*. (G.) Th^=*Is*, Th^=*Izos*, Th^=*Is*. D. and Abl. Th^=*Am*,

 Th^=*Ære*,

Th^=*Ære*, Th^=*Am*. (G.) Th^=*Amma*, Th^=*Izai*, Th^=*Amma*. A. Th^=*One*, Tha, Th^=*At*. (G.) Th^=*Ana*, Tho, Th^=*Ata*. N. Pl. Tha. (G.) Thai, Tho, Th^=*Os*, Tho. Gen. Th^=*Æra*. (G.) Th^=*Ize*, Th^=*Izo*, Th^=*Ize*. D. and Abl. Th^=*Am*. (G.) Th^=*Aim*. A. Tha. (G.) Th^=*Ans*, Tho, Th^=*Os*, Tho. I consider, that Se, Seo, Sa, and So represent the original form of the article in its simple state,—that the *Th*, at the beginning of the other parts, is quasi The, Se, as in *Th=At*, *Th=Ata*, *Th=Æs*, *Th=Is*, which are quasi The=*At*, The=*Ata*, The=*Æs*, The=*Is;* and that the At, Ata, Æs, Is are the terminations of Inflexion, which belong likewise to our Element ^S, ^T, &c., when the breathing precedes the Radical, and which were originally significant, and denoted the Is, Ita, (Gothic,) His, Hit, (Sax.) Is, Id, (Lat.) It, (Eng.) *This* or *That* Being or Thing, &c. Thus we see, that Th=At, (Sax. and English,) Th=Ata, (Goth.) are compositions of our Element, under different forms, discharging the same office of Demonstrative Pronouns, and combined for the purpose of adding to the force of the signification, as The=It or The—*Such* a person or Thing, The—The. We see in Th^=Ære, Th^=Am, Th^=Amma, Th^=One, &c., that the Elements ^R, ^M, ^N, have been adopted with the same meaning.

In the Greek Article we see the To, Tou, Too, Tee, Ta, (το, του, τω, τη, τα,) coinciding with the simple form, Se, Seo, Sa, So, Die, De, The; and in the other parts we unequivocally see a compound arising from the T^ or To, the original article, and a termination common to all the Greek Nouns, as T^={Ees, Een, Ain, As, On, Oin, Oon, Ois, Ous, (της, την, ταιν, τας, τον, τοιν, των, τοις, τους.) In German the article appears thus; N. D^=*Er*, *Die*, D^=*As*. G. D^=*Es*, D^=*Er*, D^=*Es*. D. and Abl. D^=*Em*, D^=*Er*, D^=*Em*. A. D^=*En*, *Die*, D^=*As*. Pl. N. and A. *Die*. G. D^=*Er*. D. and Abl. D^=*En*. The Article D=*Er*, *Die*, and D=*As* performs at once the part of the Demonstrative and Relative Pronouns.

In

In Dutch, HET and DE are Articles, where we have our Element, under both its forms, of the vowel breathing before and after the Radical consonant. We observe the same species of composition in the formation of all these Articles, Gothic, Saxon and German; and they differ in nothing but in having sometimes different compounds to express different cases, as they are called, which is the effect of accident. The compounds have the same original meaning in all the examples; which is that of an intensive sense, denoting ^THE-}^S, ^R, ^M, ^N, THE—*Such* a Being, Thing, &c.—*This*—*This*, *That*—*That*, Being or Thing.

That my idea respecting the nature of this composition is just, will be manifest from considering the simplest state, which these Radicals ^S, ^M, ^N assume, as Demonstrative parts of Speech. We may consider this simple state to be exhibited in the Latin HIC and IS—in the Saxon and Gothic HIT, Is, and the Greek Os, (Oς); and we shall find, that terms, like these, have supplied the materials for the Inflexions of Nouns, which exist in those Languages. Thus we shall see, that the Inflexions or the terminations, added to the Radical parts of words, of Latin and Greek Nouns, were nothing originally but postpositive articles, performing precisely the same office as the prepositive, and denoting *This* — *That* — *Such*, &c. We shall not fully understand the force of these observations, unless the words are produced at length, and compared with each other.

The Latin HIC and IS, we know, are thus represented; N. Sing. *Hic*, *Hæc*, *Hoc*. G. *Huj=Us*. D. *Huic*. A. *Hunc*, *Hanc*, *Hoc*. Ab. *Hoc*, *Hâc*, *Hoc*. Nom. Pl. *Hi*, *Hæ*, *Hæc*. G. *Hor=Um*, *Har=Um*, *Hor=Um*. D. and Abl. *His*. A. *Hos*, *Has*, *Hæc*. N. Sing. *Is*, *Ea*, *Id*. G. *Ej-Us*. D. *Ei*. A. *Eum*, *Eam*, *Id*. Ab. *Eo*, *Eâ*, *Eo*. N. Pl. *Ii*, *Eæ*, *Ea*. G. *Eor=Um*, *Ear Um*, *Eor=Um*. D. and Abl. *Iis*, *Eis*, A. *Eos*, *Eas*, *Ea*. In Saxon we have, Nom. Sing. *He*, *Heo*, *Hit*. G. *His*, *Hire*, *His*. D. and Abl. *Him*, *Hire*, *Him*. Acc. *Hine*, *Hi*, *Hit*.

Hit. Nom. and Acc. Pl. *Hi.* G. *Hira, Heora.* D. and Abl. *Him.* In Gothic we have Nom. Sing. *Is, Si, Ita.* G. *Is, Iz=Os, Is.* D. and Abl. *Imma, Izai, Imma.* A. *Ina, Ija, Ita.* N. Pl. *Eis, Ij=Os, Ija,* G. *Ize, Izo.* Dat. and Abl. *Im.* Acc. *Ins, Ij=Os, Ija.* In the Latin *Hic* and Is we find all the parts in their simple state, except the Genitives singular and plural, *Huj=Us, Ej=Us, Hor=Um, Har-Um, Eor=Um, Ear=Um,* where we see the process of Inflexion commenced. In the Saxon all the parts are in their simplest state, and so they are in the Gothic, except in the *Iz=Os* and *Ij=Os.* In the Greek we shall find, that every part is in its simplest form. Thus we have Sing. N. *Os,* Ee, O. G. *Ou, Es, Ou.* D. *Oo, Ee, Oo.* A. *On, Eeen, O.* Dual, N. and A. *Oo, A, Oo.* G. and D. *Oin, Ain, Oin.* Plur. N. *Oi, Ai, A.* G. *Oon.* D. and Abl. *Ois, Ais, Ois.* A. *Ous, As, A.* (N. Sing. Ος, η, ο. G. ου, ης, ου. D. ω, η, ω. A. ον, ην, ο. N. A. Dual, ω, α, ω. G. D. οιν, αιν, οιν. N. Pl. οι, αι, α. G. ων. D. οις, αις, οις. A. ους, ας, α.) The Relative Pronoun, as it is called, is only another turn of meaning to the Demonstrative, which was the original. Thus they are perpetually combined with each other, as in *That,* &c.—He is a Man, *That* I regard; which means, He is a Man,—*That* Man I regard. This union is fully understood; and every one knows, that Os, (Ος,) is familiarly used for Aut-*os,* (Αυτος,) Η δ' Ος, Dixit ille. Thus then the Relative Pronoun Os, (Ος,) may be considered, as representing originally the Demonstrative Pronoun, and agreeing with Is, &c. &c., Eos, Os, (Εος, Ος, Suus,) the Out, and Aut, and Ek, and the Ek=Ast in Out=*Os,* Aut=*Os,* Ek=*Ein=Os,* Ek=Ast-*os,* (Ουτος, Αυτος, Εκεινος, Εκαστος,) &c. &c. The *Ein,* in Ek=*Ein-os,* belongs to the Element ^N. When I say, that the Inflexions of Nouns have arisen from such simple forms, representing Being, in these various Languages, I cannot be supposed to affirm, that in every instance the cases coincide with each other; but I mean to observe, that we shall clearly and unequivocally perceive, that such

such were the materials, of which the Inflexions are composed, and that the record of these materials is preserved with a precision, which we should little have expected to discover.

We shall now see, that the Inflexions of the Saxon and Gothic Articles, as Nom. *Th=At.* G. *Th=Æs, Th^=Ære, Th^*-Is. D. *Th^=Am, Th^=Ære, Th^Am,* are compounds of *Th^*, representing *Se,* or THE, and the Demonstrative Pronoun, HIT, ITA, as N. *Th^=Hit.* G. *Th^=Is, Th^=Hire, Th^=Is.* D. *Th^=Him, Th^=Hire, Th^=Him,* &c. &c. &c. Again, in the Gothic article, Nom. *Th^=Ata.* G. *Th^=Is, Th^=Izos, Th=Is,* we have N. *Th^=Ita.* G. *Th^=Is, Th^=Izos, Th^=Is,* &c. &c. The Inflexions of the Saxon and Gothic Nouns belong to the same Elements, which we find in the Demonstrative Pronouns; though they do not always correspond with each other in the particular cases. We find however universally, that the Dative Plural terminates in ^M, as *Smith*=UM, To or With Smiths, which I consider to be *Smith*=HIM, To or With *Those* Smiths, &c. &c.; and in Gothic, *Himin*=AM, To or With Heavens, which I consider to be quasi *Himin*=IM, To or With *Those* or *Th*=EM *Heavens,* if I may so express it. In the first Declension of the Saxon, and the first, second and fifth of the Gothic, the Genitive ends in ^S, as *Smith*=Es, Of a Smith, which is quasi *Smith*-HIS, Of *That* Smith—*Himin*=Is, Of *That* Heaven; from whence, we know, has been derived our ^*S* in the Genitive case, as The *Smith'*S Work, &c. &c. The English HIS, we see, belongs to these words, and means *That* Person. It would be idle to attempt to adjust, whether HIS should be considered as the Nominative *Is,* (Goth.) or as directly taken from the Genitive Is, (Goth.) HIS, (Sax.); and we now see, that those who have supposed, that our Genitive case in ^*S, The Smith'*S *Work,* meant the *Smith* HIS *Work,* are at once wrong and right. They are wrong, because this Genitive case was certainly directly taken from the familiar use of the Saxon and Gothic Genitive, *Smith*=Es, &c.; and they

they are right, because this Saxon termination *Es* or His, and the Pronoun His, have the same origin, and cannot be distinguished from each other in the meaning, which they convey, as in *The Smith*'S *Work*, and the Smith His Work.

This Analogy of the Genitive ending in ^S is very general. Thus we have it in two Declensions of the Latins, *Lapis*, *Lapid*=Is, *Grad*=Us; and originally in another Declension, *Familia*=^*S*, Of a Family; in the Article and Demonstrative Pronouns, *Huj*=Us, *Ej*=Us, and in some other Adjectives, as *Un*=Ius, &c; in the second Declensions of the Greek Parisyllabics, and in the fifth Imparisyllabic, together with all the five Declensions of the Contracted Nouns, as *Tim*=Es, *Somat*=Os, *Ast*=Eos, &c. (Τιμης, Σωματος, Αστεος.) We see, that this termination originally belonged to the Saxon and Gothic His—Is, &c.; and it is extremely curious, that the affinity of the Languages should have been preserved in points so minute. In German the most familiar termination of the Genitive singular is ^S. In one Declension of the Russian nouns, the Genitive Singular adds T to the Nominative, as *Ditia*, An Infant, *Ditia*=^Ti, Of an Infant. In the Adjectives the Genitive singular terminates in *Ago* in the Masculine and Neuter, and the plural in *Ouixe*, as *Dobr*=Ago, Of a Good Man or thing, and *Dobr*=Ouixe, Of Good men, women, or things.—In the Hindostanee Dialects, *Kau*, *Kay*, *Ko*, *Say* are added to Nouns, in order to mark cases, as *Sauheb*-Kau *Ghoorau*, The Horse of the Master, as it is in English *Master*-^S *horse;* where the *Kau* and the ^S seem to correspond precisely with each other, except only that the vowel breathing before the ^*Kau* is lost. In these Dialects, Ak or Eek is the Article, corresponding, as we see, with the Latin Hic, as Eek *ghoorau*, A Horse.

In Latin the Inflexions of the Nouns, where vowels do not appear, belong to the Elements ^S and ^M, as *Mus*} Is, As, Am, *Ar*=Um; *Domin*} Us, Is, Os, Um, *Or*=Um; *Regn*} Is, Um, *Or*=Um; *Nub*} Es,

Nub}Es, Is, *Ib*=Us, Em, Ium; *Grad*}Us, *Ib*=Us, Um, Uum; *Faci*-}Es, *Eb*=Us, Em, *Er*=Um. We may consider these words, as compounds of the Radical part, expressing the sense of each word, and the Demonstrative Pronouns. Thus *Mus*-Is is *Mus*-}Iis, or Eis, *Mus*-Am, *Faci*-Em, *Mus*-Eam, *Faci*=Eam, *Mus*-Ar=Um, *Faci*-Er=Um, *Mus*-}Har-Um, Ear-Um, and *Domin*-Us is quasi *Faci*-}Har-Um, Ear-Um, and *Domin*-Us is quasi *Domin*-}Is, Hic, *That* Master, *Domin*-Is, *Domin*-}Iis, Eis, His, *Domin*-Os, *Domin*-}Eos, Hos, *Domin*-Um, *Domin*-Eum, *Domin*-Or=Um, Domin}Eor=Um, Hor=Um. Even the Vowels *A* and *O* have been preserved in *Mus-A* and *Domin-O*, to accord with *Mus-Ea* and *Domin-Eo*.—We shall not wonder, that this coincidence of the termination with the Demonstrative Pronoun is not preserved in all cases; but our wonder will be much excited, that it has been so unequivocally exhibited in so many. Under some forms, however, the resemblance is still more complete. Even the *Id* is preserved in some; *Ali-}Us*, A, Ud, is quasi Ali-}Is, Ea, Id. In these, too, the ^S or Us of the Genitive is preserved, as *Ali*-Us, such as we find it in *Huj*-Us, *Ej*-Us; and we have moreover *Ali-I*^, quasi *Ali*=Ei. The ^S of the Genitive is preserved likewise, as we have seen, sometimes in the first, *Famili*=As, in the third Declension, *Nub*=Is, *Lapid*=Is, and in the fourth, *Grad*}Us. The Em in the Accusative singular of the third and fifth, and the Um of the fourth, belong, we see, to the Eum, Eam. In the second Declension the *Eum* or *Um* is applied in the Neuter to three cases. The Um in the Genitive plural of the third and fourth Declensions, *Nubi*-Um, *Lapid*-Um, *Gradu*-Um, is in a state, preceding that, to which we find the ^R prefixed, as *Hor=Um*, *Har=Um*, Domin-}*Or=Um*, Mus}*Ar=Um*. The Pronoun Qu=Is, *Qu=Id*, *Qu=Od* is unequivocally a compound of Qui and Is, Id; and in the other parts, *Cu*=^*Jus*, *Cu=I*, *Qu*}*Em*, *Am*, *Orum*, *Arum*, *Eis*, we have likewise compounds of *Qui* and *Ejus*, *Ei*, *Eum*, *Eam*, *Eorum*,

Eorum, *Earum*, *Eis*. In the *Ibus*, of *Qu=Ibus*, we have the Dative according to another analogy.

The Dative and Ablative plural of the third, fourth, and fifth Declension, deserves our attention. We there see a combination of the Element ^M, ^B, with ^S, the termination, as Nub-}IB=*Us*, Grad}IB=*Us*, *Faci*}EB=*Us*; and the same thing we know sometimes takes place in the first, as Fili}AB=*Us*. It is curious to observe, how widely this formation of the Dative and Ablative Plural, with the Element ^M, ^B, &c., has been extended. In the Saxon and Gothic Articles, the Dative and Ablative Plural ends in ^M, as *Th*-AM, *Th*-AIM; and even in the same cases of the Singular we see a similar termination, as *Th*-AM, *Th*-AMMA. In Latin too we have sometimes the ^B in the singular, as well as in the plural, as *T*=IB*i*, *S*=IB*i*;—*N*=OB=*is*, *V*=OB=*Is*. In the four declensions of the Saxon, and in the five of the Gothic, the Dative and Ablative plural terminates in ^M, as *Smith*=UM, To or With *Smiths*, *Himin*=AM, To or With *Heavens*, &c. &c. &c. In some Dialects of the Celtic the same fact takes place. According to General Vallancey's arrangement, the same cases in the five Declensions of the Irish Nouns end in ^B*h*, as *Boghadh*=UIB*h*, To or With *Bows*, &c. &c. This is the form, as we see, preceding the Latin form, where the *Us* is added to the *Ub*, as in *Arc*=UB=*Us*, To or With Bows. The same termination is adopted by some in the Galic Dialect, though others do not approve of it. "The Reverend Mr. Macfarlane," (says Mr. Shaw,) "in his translations and psalms, uniformly uses IBH in the *Dative* "*and Ablative Plural*; which I think too much resembles the "Irish Dialect."

In the Galic and Irish Dialects of the Celtic, *Ibh* and *Sibh* are *Ye* and *You*; where the *S*=^*Ibh*, we perceive, is a compound, and the *S*^ belongs to SE, So, &c., He, That, Such a person, &c. To *S*^=*Ibh* we must refer the Latin *S*^=*Ibi*, and probably the Greek

Greek *Sphe*, (Σφε, Sui et Illorum, quasi *S^=Phe.*) If *Sphe*, (Σφε,) be not a compound, the *S* may be an organical addition to the P^, which we must assuredly consider as a Radical and significant Consonant. It sometimes appears in its simplest form *Phi*, and again *Phi=N*, (Φι, vel Φιν, Syllaba Paragogica, quam Poetæ dativis sing. et pl. addunt); where we have the Element ^P, applied to the Dative, as in the other examples. The term *Phi*, when it is applied to the Dative, will accord with the more general analogy; as in *Auto=*^PHI, (Αυτοφι, seu Αυτοφιν, Ibi;—Ipsis, pro dativo, Αυτοις); but it is applied likewise to other cases. Let us note, moreover, its sense of *Ibi*, which belongs to ^*Phi*, denoting *That;* and let us remember the Italian *Vi*, *That* Place, precisely coinciding in sense and form with the Greek PHI. In the sense, which VI bears of You, coinciding with Vo=s, it only means *That*, *Those*, or Such a person or persons, applied to the *second* person. We cannot doubt, that SPHE, (Σφε,) and its parallels SPH-*eis*, &c., are compounds, and that they belong to the Celtic terms, when we remember, that *S*=^PHO, (Σφω,) Ye two, has precisely the same meaning as the Celtic *S^*=IBH, Ye. In the Greek *Phse*, (Ψε, Dor. pro Σφας,) perhaps the Greek *s* may be an organical addition to the *Ph*, or it may represent a compound of *Phi* and *Se*. The Latin *Ip=Se* seems to be a compound of *Ip* and *Se*. In Welsh, *Efe*, *Ef*, *Efo*, and *Fe*, *Fo*, denote He, Him, It, &c. In the Hindostan Dialects, *Aup* denotes Self, as HUM AUP HOOVA, I myself *Am;* where we have the Element ^M, ^P, &c., applied to various purposes. The Latin Particle *Pte*, or ^*P=Te*, may be a compound, as in *Ip=Se*. In *Suo=Pte*, we find it applied to its kindred term—the Pronoun *Suo*. The *P* however may be an organical addition to the *Te*.

English and Saxon terminations in Y, IG, ESSE, STER, *&c.— Degrees of Comparison in English—Saxon—Greek, and Latin.*

THE termination of the Greek and Latin Nouns in ^S, &c. &c., *Log*-Os, (Λογος,) *Kal*-Os, (Καλος,) *Hilar*=Is, *Bon*=Us, Div=Es, &c. &c., is precisely that, which takes place in other Languages. Thus, in our Language, ISH denotes *This* or *That* Being or Thing, as *Engl*=ISH, *That*, Being or Thing, of England, or relating to England. This termination in Saxon is *Isc*, as *Engl*=Isc. The *Y* in our Language, when it is annexed to a certain race of words, represents the Element ^C, ^G, &c., bearing a similar meaning; as in *Drear-Y*, *Merr-Y*, &c. Manning in his Saxon Grammar observes, concerning the termination of Adjectives, "Multa exeunt in *IG;* ut *Drear*=IG, *Mœstus;* *Myr*=IG, Hilaris; "*Æn*=IG, Quispiam; *Twent*=IG, Viginti. Hanc nos vertimus "in *Y;* ut *drear=Y*, *merr=Y*, *an=Y*, *twent=Y.*" The *IG* in these words has precisely the same meaning as the Us and Is in *Mœst*=Us, and *Hilar*=Is, &c. &c. The Element ^N has a similar meaning, both in English and Latin. Manning again justly observes, "Materialia exeunt in EN, ut *Æsc*=EN, Fraxineus; *Buc*=EN, "Fagineus; *Stæn*=EN, Lapideus. Sic nos etiam dicimus, *Ash*=EN, "*Beach=En*, &c. Et alia quædam nonnulla, ut *Midl*=EN, Medi- "oxumus." The latter word *Midl*=EN is our English *Middl*=ING, where in the ING we see another representation; and we shall now understand, that the EN in *Ash*=EN, and the ING of the Participle, are only different forms of each other, bearing the same meaning. Let us mark the IN in the explanatory Latin words *Fag*=IN-*eus*, *Frax*=IN-*Eus*, which we see performs the same

same office as the English *En*. The *Fag=In* and the *Beach=En* precisely coincide with each other in both their component parts.

Manning observes in another place, that many Saxon Feminines end in *Esse*, &c. "Fœminina quam plurima in *Esse*, *Isse*, "*Nesse*, *Nysse*; ut *Cneor*=Esse, vel Isse, Generatio; *Thrinn*=Esse, "*Trinitas*; *Sothfæst*=Nysse, Veritas." The Saxon *Nesse* belongs to the English *Ness* in *Righteous*-Ness. The *n* in *n*-Esse, may perhaps have arisen from an organical process. We here see, that the Esse in the Saxon *Cneor*=Esse precisely coincides with the At in the Latin *Gener*=At*io*; and the *Gener*, we see, coincides with the *Cneor*. There is another thing likewise remarkable in this Saxon addition. We perceive, that the Saxon Esse is added to Adjectives in order to form Substantives, as *Drin*=Esse, Trinitas; and we may observe, that in Latin Substantives, formed from Adjectives, there are two additions, It and As, as *Trin*=It-*As*, *Bon*=It-*As*; where the It directly coincides with the Saxon Esse, and the *As* was afterwards added for the purpose of conforming to the analogy of the Latin Language. Thus we see, that the Latin formation of words is sometimes directly connected with the Saxon, and that the state, in which certain words appear before they become Latin, may be considered as purely Saxon.

Manning observes in another place, "Masculina personalia "multa in Er, vel Ere, ad *artem*, *habitum*, vel *officium* spectantia; "quorum fœminina exeunt in *Estre*, *Istre*, vel *Ystre*; ut *Sæd*=Ere, "*Sæd*=Ystre; *Bæc*=Ere, Pistor; *Bæc*=Estre, *Pistrix*." The Er, or Ere, belongs, we see, to the Element ^R, and coincides with the Latin Or in *Pist*=Or, the English Er in *Bak*=Er, &c. &c. In the formation of these words, *Bæc*=Est-^*Re*, &c., from *Bæc=Ere*, the Est is employed as a feminine addition, and is inserted before the *Ere*, as *Bæc=Ere*, *Bæc*=Est=*Ere*, or

Bæc=

Bæc=Est=^*Re*. The Est, denoting the female, coincides with the Ix of the Latins in *Meretr*=Ix, *Cantatr*=Ix. The Saxon mode of insertion in forming these words is not common; as the process generally takes place by termination. In the usual colloquial mode, now adopted, the Ess is added to the ^R, as a *Bak*=*Er*=Ess; and so strong is the necessity of this analogy impressed upon our minds, that we even add the Ess to the *Ster*, which denoted of itself originally the Female, but which we consider only as a termination for Person in general; as *Song*=*Str*=Ess. In Latin, too, the Ix is added to the ^R, as *Cantat*=^*R*=Ix, quasi *Cantat*=Or=Ix, *Pist*=*R*=Ix, quasi *Pist*=*Or*=Ix. The *Ster* is used in its original Saxon meaning for a Female in *Spin*=Ster; but in *Poet*=Aster, the Aster is adopted as a termination of contempt, q. d. Not a *Poet*, but A *Poet*=Aster, a *She* kind of a Poet. In *Pun*=Ster, &c. &c., the Ster is likewise used as a term of contempt, q. d. the foolish personage, who deals in Puns. That the Ster, the termination for the Female, should be adopted to express *Inferiority*, we shall not wonder; when we consider that the Female, in the ordinary works of labour, would be naturally regarded, as inferior to the Man, the *Bæc*=Est=^*Re*, to the *Bæc*=*Ere*, &c. &c. It is curious to observe, by what artifices of composition, Languages have been formed; and how dextrously the various artists employed in the work have accomplished their purpose, without communicating with each other on the mode of performing it; and without any knowledge of the art, by which it is effected. Thus we see in *Cant*=At=^R=Ix, a triple composition, with the same Radical meaning applied to different purposes. By the addition of At to the *Cant*, we have the action of singing expressed,—by a second addition of the ^R, or Or, we have the Male agent, employed in that action; and by another addition, Ix, we have the Female.

In Saxon, as in English, the Comparative and Superlative degrees

degrees end in ^R, and ^ST, &c., where our Elements still retain their meaning of *This*—or *That* Personage or Thing, by way of *Eminence* or *Distinction*, as *Strong*, *Strong*=ER, *Strong*=EST, quasi *Strong*—*Strong*=*Er*, not He Strong, but *This* Strong; *Strong*=EST, Not *He* or *This* Strong, but *That* Strong. In Latin the Comparative is the same as in English ending in ^R, and the Superlative differs by adding the Element ^M to ^S, as *Doct*=*us*, *Doct*-}IOR, ISS=IM=*us*. Some adjectives add only the ^M for the Superlative, as *Humill*=IM=*us*. The Greeks combine the Elements ^S, ^T, &c., and ^R, for the Comparative, and double the Element ^S, ^T, &c. for the Superlative, as *Phronim*}*os*, OOT=ER-*os*, OOT=AT-*os*, (Φρονιμος, φρονιμωτερος, φρονιμωτατος.) Sometimes the Element ^N, ^NT is combined with ^R for the Comparative, and with ^S, ^T, &c. for the Superlative; and sometimes the Elements ^N, and ^S, ^T, &c. appear uncompounded for these Degrees of Comparison, as Mel-}*as*, ANT=ER-*os*, ANT=AT-*os*, *Eur*-}*us*, IOON, IST-*os*, (Μελας, μελαντερος, μελαντατος, Ευρυς, ευριων, ευριστος.)—I shall not produce any other examples from those Languages, whose degrees of comparison are formed by the addition of our Elements, as the same meaning prevails of the *Demonstrative* Adjective—*This* or *That* Being or Thing, by way of Eminence or Distinction. The artifice, by which degrees of comparison are formed, is precisely of the same sort with that, by which words are rendered Diminutives, or Augmentatives, as *Paid*=ISKE, (Παιδισκη, Puellula,) A little girl; where the ISKE means *This*—*That*, by way of Distinction; and the *Ula*, in *Puell*=*Ula*, has the same meaning.—The instance, in which the Demonstrative part of Speech itself has undergone the last degree of comparison, will strongly illustrate my ideas on this subject. We all remember, in the Plutus of Aristophanes, the superlative AUTOTATOS. Carion says to Plutus, Εκεινος ουτως ει συ; 'Are you indeed *That*—Per-'sonage?' Pl. Ναι, 'Yes,' says Plutus; when Carion again asks,

asks, Εκεινος αυτος;—'*That—That*—Personage?' to which Plutus again replies, Αυτοτατος, '*Autotatos;*' where we have in fact the Aut in *Aut*-os thrice repeated, quasi Aut=Aut=Aut-*os*; *That—That—That* Personage. We know, that the Latin Ips=Iss=Im=*us* is likewise a Superlative from *Ipse.* In Ek=Ein-*os* we have unequivocally a compound of the Elements ^K and ^N, bearing the same meaning. I shall shew in a future page, that *Nai,* (Ναι,) *Yes,* belongs to the Element N^; where the breathing before the N^ is lost, and means nothing but *The—This* or *That* Person.—The English Yes must be referred to our Element ^S, and to the race of words now under discussion, either considered as the Adjective or the verb,—*IT, This* or *That,* or *IS*—It *IS* so and so. This I observe on another occasion, and I shall now here illustrate the matter more fully. In old English, the term of affirmation connects itself with the form of the Pronoun of the first person, which it will be necessary first to examine.

Terms of Affirmation.

Yes. (Eng.) *It is.*

Aye. (Eng.) quasi Aje.

Yea, Ja—Jai, Gea, Ia, Ie, Ya, Ja. (Eng. Goth. Sax. &c. &c.)

Ys, Es. (Welsh,) Truly.

Aio, quasi Ajo. (Lat.) I *Yes, Is, It,* a thing, if we may so say, I say, *It Is*—so and so.

Be=Jahen. (Germ.) To *Be=Ja* a thing, To affirm a thing.

The Elements, denoting *Existence,* or *This—That* Being or Thing, are equally applicable, as we perceive, to all persons; and it is accident alone which operates in the adoption of the Person, to

to which they are applied. The Element ^C, ^G is used, as we have before seen, for the first Person, in many Languages; and the Etymologists have accordingly produced, as the parallel terms to *I*, the Gothic IK, the Saxon Ic, the German ICH, the Runic EG, the Danish *j*-EG, the Belgic ICK, the Greek EGOO, and the Latin EGO, the French *Je*, the Italian *Io*, and the Spanish *Yo*. In the English *I*, the Radical ^G, or ^C, &c. is lost; but in the French *Je*, the breathing before the Radical Consonant is lost. In Spanish and Italian, the same fact takes place as in the French; and the I and the Y represent the consonant J. Skinner has two articles for *I*, of which one is the Pronoun *I*, and the other he explains by "*Etiam*, *Ita*, mirifice corruptum," as he says, "à *Yes*." We shall agree, that *Aye*, quasi *Aje*, and YES, belong to this race of words, and mean EST—Is—the thing Is so or so, or IT—ID—*That*—*This Thing*—the Thing Is in *This*—*That* manner. I again use the verb Is in my sentence; as we cannot separate Is from IT, in a Declaratory or Demonstrative proposition, IT Is, except by the mode, in which they are used, as different parts of Speech. The term I, Etiam, has lost the Radical Consonant, as I the Pronoun has done, and is only another form of YES, as I the Pronoun is of ICH. In *Yea*, which I consider to be quasi *Jea*, the breathing before the Consonant is lost, and is converted into *Y*, as in the Spanish *Yo*. In Shakspeare we have *I*, as the ancient mode of speaking and writing the affirmative particle. The following pun, however contemptible, will serve to illustrate this fact. In *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, we have, "*(Pro.)* But "what said she? did she nod? *(Speed.)* I. *(Pro.)* Nod, I? why "that's *Noddy*. *(Speed.)* You mistook, Sir: I say she did nod: "and you ask me, if she did nod; and I say, I. *(Pro.)* And "that set together is *Noddy*." Mr. Malone observes, that "in "Speed's answer, the old spelling of the affirmative particle has "been retained, otherwise the conceit of Protheus (such as it is)

"would

"would be unintelligible." Let us mark the *Y* in *Nodd-Y*, which is for IG, as in *Merr-Y*, &c., which means the IG, the Being or Person Nodding.

Lye has added an article to the I, the Pronoun, produced by Junius; where he observes, that I and Y were frequently used, as the Saxon *Ge*, as *I=bathed*, *I=bore*. The *I* or *Y* has the same meaning of *Being*, as in other instances, and seems to be quasi *Ye*, *Ge*, diretly connected with the Saxon and German *Ge*, the Gothic *Ga*, &c. We use *Be*, belonging to the Element B^, to *Be-ing*, &c., precisely in the same manner, *Be-Moan*, *Be*-Loved. Every one acknowledges how the *G* in Saxon words passes into *Y*, or *I*. Lye begins that part of his Saxon and Gothic Dictionary, where the words commencing with *G* are recorded, with the following remark: "Anglo-Saxonum, in fine vocum, *G* apud "posteriores Anglos sæpe in *Y* vel *I* liquescit. e. gr. *Dæg. Dag.* "Day: *Cæg. Key*, &c. Similiter quandoque in medio vocum: "ut, *fæger. fair*: *Stæger. Stair*: *Sægl.* Sail: *Tægl. Tail*, &c. "In initio vocum etiam sæpe mutatur in *Y*: ut, *Ganian*, to "*Yawn*," &c. &c.

The parallel terms to YEA, the affirmative particle, which are produced by the Etymologists, are JA, JAI, (Goth.) *Gea*, (Sax.) *Ia*, (Sax. Belg. Germ.) *Ie*, (Welsh,) *Ya*, (Arm.) *Ja*, (Swedish.) Under YES, the Etymologists remind us of the Saxon *Gyse*, or *Gese*, *Gise*; and these words may either simply denote IT, &c., or they may be compounds of GE, *The*, &c. IT, &c. Adjacent to GYSE, *Yes*, we have the Saxon *Gyt*, *Yet*, *Adhuc*; where we see, that these words belong to the same idea, and are only different forms of each other applied to other purposes. The Etymologists under *Yet* produce the Saxon *Get*, *Geta*, the German *Ietzt*, the Welsh *Etwa*, and *Etto*, and the Greek *Eti*, (Ετι.) In the Welsh and Greek words we see the simple form, whatever the other terms may be. Junius imagines, that *Yes* may be a compound of

of YEA Is. Junius produces likewise the Welsh Ys or Es, Truly. The Welsh Es is used in composition. While I am examining the Gothic JA, *Yea*, Sic, JAH, *Et*, JAI, *Yea*, Immo, I find in the same column of Lye's Dictionary *Jainar*, Ibi, Illic, *Jaind*, Illuc, *Jains*, Ille; which may be likewise compounds of *Ja*, &c., and the Element ^N, denoting Being. The Etymologists have justly produced these as parallels to the English YON, YONDER; and they have moreover added the Saxon *Eond*, *Yeond*, the Belgic *Gins*, *Gender*, &c., the German *Jene*, *Jener*, &c.—The German JA, and Je, are only different forms of each other. The true sense of JE appears in such phrases as *Ich habe sie* JE *länger*, JE *lieber*, "THE longer I have her, THE more I love her." If we do not consider *J'=Ene* as a compound of JE and ENE, belonging to EIN, One, the *j* must be regarded as only the representation of a strong vowel breathing before the ^N.—I have observed, on a former occasion, (p. 245,) that the Latin verb of Affirmation, AIO, quasi AJO, means the same as 'I *Aye* or YES a thing.' Now it is acknowledged, that the Germans actually form a verb of Affirmation from their term JA, as *Be=Jahen*, "To affirm, "avouch, assert, avow;" which literally means, "To *Be=JA*, or "*Be=AYE*, *Be=YES* a thing," as we might say. Some Etymologists derive *Aio* from the Hebrew היה *Haiah*, EST, where we have a similar origin; as my hypothesis supposes, that these terms belong to ID EST, IT IS; and it would be idle to attempt to decide on all occasions on the *Part of Speech*, as it is called, to which a certain term directly belongs, when the leading idea, existing in different Parts of Speech related to each other, has been duly ascertained. We have seen, among the explanations of these Affirmative terms, the Latin words ET*iam* and ITA, which likewise belong to ID EST.

INFLEXIONS OF GREEK NOUNS.

The Inflexions of Greek Nouns belong to the Elements ^S and ^N. The simpler form of the Element ^S in Greek appears in Eis and Os, (Ει̃ς, Ος.) They perform different offices in Greek, but they had originally the same meaning of *This* or *That* Being. The Relative and the Demonstrative parts of Speech are acknowledged to be connected with each other through the whole compass of Language; as in the English *That*, which performs both offices—'*That* is a matter, *That* deserves attention.' It is easy to understand, that the Demonstrative part of Speech would be first used, and that the Relative sense would be a secondary application. Every one knows, that in Greek, Os, (Ος,) is perpetually applied as a Demonstrative part of Speech, as Η δ' Ος, Inquit *Ille*, &c. This I conceive to have been the original use of the word. The Element ^N appears in Greek in its simplest form in the term En, (Εν, Unum.) The Greek En, (Εν, Unum,) is only another form of the English An; that is, the numerals En, (Εν,) Un-*us*, *a*, *um*, One, &c. &c., represent only a different mode of applying the Demonstrative part of Speech—An, which is called by the name of the Article, when it is familiarly used before Nouns, with a certain turn of meaning. From this simple state of the Elements ^S, ^N, as visible in the Eis, Os, (Ει̃ς, Ος,) En, (Εν,) with their Inflexions, *Enos*, (Ενος,) *Ee*, *O*, *Ou*, Ees, &c., (Η, Ο, Ου, Η̃ς,) we may conceive the Inflexions of Greek Nouns to be more immediately derived. First we may regard the Inflexions of the Parisyllabic Declensions, as additions of the Pronoun Os, *Ee*, *O*, (Ος, η, ο,) denoting *This* or *That*, to the Radical part expressing the sense of the word, except the singular of Neuter Nouns, which

which belong to the form En, (Ev); that is, in Parisyllabic Nouns, with the exception of the Neuter singular, in the Nominative, the Accusative, and Vocative, the Elements ^S and ^N exist as terminations in certain cases, and vowel breathings in other cases, because these Elements and vowel breathings exist in the same cases of the Pronoun *Os*, *Ee*, *O*, (Ος, η, ο.) Thus then, though the Elements ^S, ^N denote simply *This* or *That*, as they do in other Languages, yet in Greek they bear such a meaning under certain relations, which Grammarians call cases, because they chance to have been employed under that relation in the Greek Pronoun. In the first, third, and fourth Declensions, as Ταμιας, Λογος, Λεως, the Element ^S exists in the Nom. Sing., and the Dat. and Accus. Pl.—and ^N in the Accus. Sing., in the Gen. and Dat. Dual, and in the Gen. Pl.; and the vowel breathing in other cases, because the same thing takes place in the Masculine *Os*, (Ος,) *Ou*, &c. In the second Declension, as Τιμη, the ^S exists in the Genitive Sing., in the Dat. and Accus. Pl.—the ^N in the Accusat. Sing., in the Gen. and Dat. Dual, and the Gen. Pl.; and the vowel breathing in other cases, because they exist in the same cases in the Feminine, *Ee*, *Ees*, &c., (H, Hς.) We may observe, that both forms agree, with respect to the cases in which these Elements ^S, ^N, and the vowel breathings are found, except in the Nominative and Genitive Singular.

But this is not all; since in the third Declension, as Λογος, and in one form of the second, as Τιμη, the *same* vowel breathings are adopted in the Inflexions, both as terminations, and as preceding the Elementary consonants, which exist in the Pronoun. Thus, Os, Ou, Oo, On, added to *Log*, denoting Speech, as *Log*}Os, Ou, Oo, On, (Λογος, ε, ω, ον,) are precisely the same as the *Os*, *Ou*, *Oo*, *On*, (Ος, ου, ω, ον,) of the Pronoun, which bore originally, as I imagine, a Demonstrative signification, as *Log*-Os, *That* Speech. So in *Tim*-}Ee, Ees, Ee, Een, we have the feminine of the Pronoun

noun *Ee, Ees, Ee, Een,* (Η, ης, η, ην.) The Article, where there exists a composition, with T^, or *To,* (Το,) its original form, exhibits precisely the same combination, as T^}Ου, Οο, Ον, Ες, Ε, Εν, (Του, τω, τον, της, τη, την,) &c. &c. In the Nominative feminine Singular, and masculine and feminine plural, where the T^ is not found, the Demonstrative and Relative Pronouns agree, as *Ee, Oi, Ai,* (η, οι, αι.) In the Neuter *On,* as Xul}Ον, we have the form of Εν, (Εν.) We perceive in the participle Οον, Ον, (Ων, Ον,) another simple form of *En,* (Εν.) In the feminine Ous*a* we have the simple form of Εις, (Εις,) with the feminine vowel termination, Εις-*a,* as in Mous-*a,* (Μουσα.) The Participles of the ordinary verbs are compounds of the part expressing the action of the verb, and these simpler forms, *Oon, Ousa, On,* (Ων, ουσα, ον,) or ^N^, ^S^, ^N, or ^S, ^S^, ^N, as Tupt}Οον, Ουσα, Ον, (Τυπτων, τυπτουσα, τυπτον,) Tup=s}As, Asa, An. In one form we have the ^S and the ^N with the same vowel breathings before them, as in Εις, Εν, (Εις, Εν,) and likewise a feminine, Εις=*a,* formed from Εις, (Εις,) as Tufth}Εις, Εις-*a,* Εν. The term *Mia,* (Μια,) signifying *One,* as relating to a Female, belongs to the Element M^, and has nothing to do with *Eis or En,* (Εις, Εν,) but in the arrangements of the Grammarian. Though the *Eis* or *En* may be considered perhaps as originally belonging to each other, which will be more fully illustrated in the course of our enquiries; still, however, when the forms ^S, ^N have been once constituted, they may be regarded as distinct Elements, denoting Being in their simplest state. The Inflexions, which the Grammarians have attributed to Os, (Ος,) still preserve the simple state of the Elements ^S, ^N; but in the genitive *En*-Os, (Ενος,) from *En,* (Εν,) we see the process of Inflexion already begun.

The Reader will be fully aware, that when I speak of these Inflexions or Terminations of Nouns, as signifying *This* or *That,* I must refer only to their original use and meaning. When this

original

original meaning was lost, these terminations were considered by the Greeks, as they are by us, merely as Inflexions; and were adopted only for the purpose of conforming to the analogy of the Language, without any knowledge or idea respecting their primitive use. The Reader will likewise understand, that when I produce certain examples, I do not mean to assert, that the terminations in the peculiar instances, which are exhibited, were originally significant; but to observe in general, that similar terminations were thus significant in the earliest stages of the Language; and that the common analogy has been formed from this source. It is necessary to remark, likewise, that these terminations in the Nominative of Nouns are not always additions arising from the analogy of the Language, but that they frequently constitute a part of the Radical of the word. Sometimes however peculiar vowels are assumed in order to comply with that analogy. Thus *Laos*, and *Leoos*, (Λαος, Λεως, Att. Populus,) belong to the Element LS, though the *O* and *Oo* are adopted to conform with that analogy of the Greek Language, which the Grammarians describe by the third and fourth Declensions of Parisyllabic Nouns. Again, in *Laas*, (Λαας, Lapis,) we have the Radical form; but in LITH-*os*, (Λιθος, Lapis,) we see, that the *Os* is an addition arising from the construction of the Language, and the *Lith* is the Radical part belonging to *Laas*. The words *Laos* and *Laas*, (Λαος, Λαας,) belong to *Lego*, *Lekso*, (Λεγω, Λεξω, Cubo,) To *Lie*, or *Light*; *Licgean*, (Sax.) *Liegen*, (Germ.) &c.&c. *Low*; *Leeg*, (Belg.) as on the *Last*; *Loisthos*, (Λοισθος,) Spot, i.e. on the *Lay*, *Lea*, *Leag*, (Sax.) or Ground. In *Pur*, (Πυρ,) we have another Radical form, belonging to *Fire*, &c. Plato has already discovered, that the Greek Language was not *wholly* and *absolutely* the *sole* creation of Greek minds and Greek organs, but that *some* words at least were adopted from other beings—from Barbarians—who had no pretensions to the honours of the Grecian name.

name. The term PUR, (Πυρ,) is acknowledged to be amongst those words, which were borrowed from a *Barbarian* mouth.

The Imparisyllabic Declension of Greek Nouns, forms the Genitive in ^S, *Eris, Erid-o*S, *Botrus, Botru-o*S, (Ερις, Ερίδος, Βοτρυς, Βοτρυος,) &c. &c., as the second Declension of Parisyllabic Nouns does, *Time, Time-*^S, (Τιμη, Τιμης.) This coincides with the more general analogy, as I have before observed. We perceive, that in both these forms there is alike an increase in the Genitive; and yet the Grammarians have chosen to distinguish them by names, which are meant to express, that in one form there is an increase, and in the other there is none. "Quatuor priores declinationes "simplicium sunt *Parisyllabicæ*, i. e. *non* crescentes genitivo. "Quinta vero est *Imparisyllabica*, i.e. genitivo crescens."—The increase of the Imparisyllabic Declension in *Os* coincides with the increase of *Eis*, *En*, (Εις, Εν,) *Oon*, *On*, (Ων, Ον,) in *Os*, (Ενος, Οντος); and they agree in the other terminations, which they have, as in *i*, *a*, in the Dat. and Accus. Sing., *e* and *oin* in the Dual, *Es* or *A*, *Oon*, *Si*, *As*, or *A*, for the Nom. Gen. Dat. and Accus. of the plural. The termination of the Accusative and Vocative Neuter is, we know, the same as the Nominative, both in Greek and in Latin. This has probably arisen from an accident attached to these simple and primitive terms, as *En*, *On*, (Εν, Ον,) ID, (Lat.) *Hit*, (Sax.) ITA, (Goth.) &c., which we find to have no variety of Inflexion in such relations, which the Grammarians express by those cases. When this was established in some terminations, the analogy extended itself to others.

The Reader is not to imagine, that my hypothesis is intended to account for every variety in the Greek Language, or in other forms of Speech, which are the objects of my discussion. The Writer must be ignorant of the principles of his art, who should pretend to such precision on such a subject, even if all the materials, from which Languages were formed, should be disclosed to his view.

view. I am desirous only of giving a general idea of certain facts, which are to be found in the records of Human Speech; and of explaining moreover, in some degree, the cause of certain modifications attendant on such facts, which distinguish different Languages from each other. I have supposed, that the Inflexions in Greek, &c. have arisen from a few simple—significant terms, denoting *This—That*, &c., which are familiarly adopted; and yet it is not to be expected, that I can produce, in a polished state of any Language, every simple and significant form, from which these Inflexions have arisen. The *Eis* into *En-Os*, (Εις, Ενος,) does not exhibit the ordinary analogy of the Language, as the *S* generally passes into one of its cognate Consonants T or D, and not into *N*, when it receives the increase of *Os* after it, as *Gel*}*oo*S, *oo*T-*os*, (Γελως, γελωτος.) It is not improbable, that a familiar simple term once existed, in which this fact took place, as it might be *Eis*, *ei*T-*os*. This is not absolutely necessary to suppose, for the support of my hypothesis; since we have only to imagine, that the addition *Os* was received from some familiar term, whatever it might be, on which the mind would seize, as characteristic of an analogy; while the *S* would undergo the changes attached to its nature, constituting likewise another analogy. The same cause, which makes the mind to fall into one analogy, renders it equally active and ready, in forming another, at the same time. This is perpetually visible, and is particularly apparent on the present occasion.—Though the form *Oos*, and the addition *Os*, might naturally arise from the existence of Eis, and the familiar addition *Os* in *En*-Os, (Ενος,) &c., yet it is probable, I think, that the form Oos, Oot-*os*, Eis, Eit-*os*, or ^S, ^T=^S, was once familiar, as a term denoting Being. In *Tetuf*-Oos, &c. (Τετυφως, τετυφυια, τετυφος, Gen. τετυφοτος,) &c., we have the Oos, or Os, *o*T-*os*; and if we should reason from the addition *Oon*, *Ousa*, *On*, *Ont-os*, in *Tupt-Oon*, &c., we might conclude that the form *Oos*, *Uia*, *On*, *Ot-os*,

Ot-os, was equally familiar in a separate state. The *Uia* I conceive to be quasi *Uja*. Among the Æolians, Eis, Eisa, En, (Εις, εισα, εν,) represented what Grammarians consider as the participle of the verb of Being. Here we see, that this accords even in its vowel breathings with the Eis and En, (Εις, Εν,) in the ordinary Language; and we have moreover the Eisa formed by a regular analogy from the Eis. In the form of the Æolian participle Eis, &c., all would recognise, under any opinions on Etymology, the adjunct in the Greek participle *Tufth*-Eis, (Τυφθεις.) The Æolians, however, seemed to have formed their genitive in *Ent-os*, (Εντος.) The Æolic Eis, Eisa, *This Man*, *This Woman*, corresponds with the artifice in the formation of the Hebrew אשה איש AIS, ASH, which Bochart represents by Is, Issa, *Man*, *Woman*.

The increase of the Genitive in Imparisyllabic Nouns, both in Greek and in Latin, will unequivocally illustrate the truth of my hypothesis, respecting the changes of those Cognate Consonants, which familiarly pass into each other, to the exclusion of the rest, in representing the same or similar ideas. Thus S, which Grammarians call a letter of *its own power*, ("Σιγμα est litera "*suæ potestatis*,") passes into T, T*h*, and D; *Gel-}ooS*, *ooT-os*, (Γελως, γελωτος,) *Kor}uS*, *uTh-os*, (Κορυς, κορυθος,) *Lamp-}aS*, *aD-os*, (Λαμπας, λαμπαδος,) and the *X*, Ξ, which is supposed to be a compound of KS, GS, C*h*S, passes into K, KT, G, C*h*, as *Kul}iX*, *iK-os*, (Κυλιξ, κυλικος,) *An-}aX*, *aKT-os*, (Αναξ, ανακτος,) Tett-}*iX*, *iG-os*, (Τεττιξ, τεττιγος,) Bee*X*, Bee*Ch-os*, (Βηξ, βηχος.) The word *LuGX*, (Λυγξ, Singultus,) makes *LuGGos*, (Λυγγος); and *LuGX*, (Λυγξ, Lynx,) makes *LuGKos*, (Λυγκος.) We here see how the sound of *N* is attached to our Element ^S, ^G, &c., though it is not the most familiar analogy; and thus, what was L*u*GX in the Nominative, might have been expressed by *LuNgos* in the Genitive. We find accordingly the termination ^S of the Nominative passing

passing into ^N or ^NT, &c. in the Genitive, as in the ordinary example, Eis, *eNos*, and in *KteiS*, Κτε*N-os*, *Gig-}aS*, *aNT-os*, *Tufth-}eiS*, *eNT-os*, (Εις, ενος, Κτεις, κτενος, Γιγας, γιγαντος, Τυφθεις, τυφθεντος.) In Latin, the changes of the Cognate Consonants are fully illustrated. Thus we have *Sal-}uS*, *uT-is*, *Lap-}iS*, *iD-is*, *Rap-}aX*, *aC-is*, *ReX*, *ReG-is*, *NoX*, *NoCT-is*, &c. &c. We see in Latin, likewise, that the N is frequently connected with the ^S, &c., as *Sang-}uiS*, *uiN-is*, *OriGo*, *OriGiN-is*, &c. &c. &c., where the *N* is an organical addition to the *G*.

It will now be understood, that S, &c. in the Nominative, passes into *N* in the Genitive, precisely by a similar process of the mind and the organs, as that by which *S* passes into T, D, &c. Those ingenious enquirers, therefore, who have written on the Imparisyllabic Declension of the Greeks, have exhibited an unnecessary solicitude to discover a Nominative case with ^NS, in order to correspond with their genitive in *N*, when that Nominative has already supplied them with an *S*. Thus, for *Kteis*, *Ktenos*, (Κτεις, Κτενος,) they suppose a *KteiNs;* for *Pas*, *Pantos*, (Πας, Παντος,) a *PaNs*, &c. &c. &c. This form ^NS would assuredly sometimes exist in the Nominative, that is, the sound of *N* would sometimes be as fully attached to the sound of *S* in the nominative, as it is to the sound of T in the genitive, and for the same reason. Still, however, our Philologists have no more reason for seeking out this form, on all occasions, as the original and proper representation of the Nominative, than for supposing that the *D* or *T*, &c. in the Genitive was always derived from a *D* or *T* in the Nominative; and thus, that in *Lampas*, *Lampad-os*, *Geloos*, *Geloot-os*, (Λαμπας, Λαμπαδος, Γελως, Γελωτος,) the original form for the Nominative was always *Lampad*, *Geloot*, or *Lampads*, *Geloots*. The affinity, which causes the *S*, &c. to pass into the D or T in the Genitive, operates likewise in causing it to pass into *N;* though the change of S, &c. into T or D, is more familiar:—That is, the

Consonants C, D, G, &c. *constantly* and *familiarly* pass into each other; and they are *frequently* connected likewise with the letter N.

The form ^N, as I have before observed, may either be considered as a separate Element, or as directly derived from the Element ^C, ^D, ^G, &c.—This point should be regarded rather as a mode of conceiving the subject, than as a matter of importance in the discussion of the question. The form ^N, when once existing, may well be considered as a separate Element; though it should be proved to have been originally derived from the Element ^C, ^D, ^G, &c., and though, as all would agree, it is frequently connected with it. This relation must be allowed by every Grammarian, and is visible in every Language. We all know, that the Greeks sometimes expressed the force of *N* by the *G*, or that the *G*, (γ,) before G, K, Ch, X, (γ, κ, χ, ξ,) had the power of *N*, which commonly appears in other Languages; as *Egchelus*, (Εγχελυς,) *Anguilla*, though the more ancient Latins wrote *Agguilla*. The Philologists, who have written on the Greek Imparisyllabic Declension, have not failed to exhibit this union of S and N. Thus, as they have observed, what was *Hortesius*, (Ορτησιος,) in Greek, became *Horte*N*sius* in Latin; and in some Manuscripts, *Thesauri* and *Quoties* are written *The*N*sauri* and *Quotie*N*s*. Sometimes the sound of the *N*, annexed to the *S*, was so faintly enunciated, that *Hortensia* and *Forensia* passed into *Hortesia* and *Foresia*, and were sometimes thus written. Again, in Latin we have *Scidi* and *Sci*N*do*, *Fregi*, *Fra*N*go*, &c. &c. In Welsh, C, G, T, D, become *Ng*, *Ng*, *Nh*, *N*, as Car-*Ngar*, *Gwas-Ngwas*, *Tad-Nhad*, *Duw-Nuw*.

In Hebrew there is a letter called Gnain, ע, and sometimes *Oin*, which different Grammarians have considered to possess the sounds of NG, GN, NGN, G, N, or simply that of a vowel breathing, *O*. In all this there is no difficulty; as we have only to conceive,

conceive, that these various sounds are annexed to the letter, precisely as the sounds of *N* and *G*, more or less, prevail in the enunciation of it. In French we know that the sound of *G* is perpetually annexed to the *N*, as *On* is sounded *Ong*. It is not necessary to illustrate at greater length a fact, which is so well known; and the Reader will be inclined, I imagine, to conceive, that the Element ^N, denoting Being, was originally derived from the Element ^C, ^D, &c. Still, however, I must again repeat, that the Element ^N, when once formed, may be considered as a distinct Element, propagating itself by its own powers, if I may so express it, and connecting itself only on certain occasions with the Element ^C, ^D, &c. From this affinity between N and C, D, &c., it has arisen, that C, &c. is oftentimes annexed to the *N*. Thus, the term *Gune* becomes, in the genitive, *Gunai*K*os*, (Γυνη, γυναικος,) where a vowel breathing has been inserted between the *N* and the *K*. Here again the Grammarians seek for a *Gunaix*, (Γυναιξ,) from which their genitive is to be derived. In English we have three names for woman, corresponding with *Gune*, and *Gunaik*, or *Gunk*, with the added K, as *Queen*, *Quean*, and *Wench*, quasi *Qwench*.

In Greek, *Gala* becomes in the genitive, we know, *Gala*C*Tos*, (Γαλα, γαλακτος.) Here again the Grammarians seek for a *Gala*X, (Γαλαξ,) in the Nominative, in order to obtain their genitive. The sound of C, D, &c. is a perpetual adjunct to the L; and whenever a word ends in L, we may always expect to find the same idea under another or the same word with the C, D, &c. annexed to the L. We shall likewise generally find, that the same idea is expressed by the form LC, &c., which may be considered as composed of the second letter L of the Radical G L, &c., and the organical addition C to the L. Thus, what is *Gala* becomes *Galact*, and afterwards *gLact*, and *Lact;* and hence we have the Latin *Lac*. The *Gu*, *Qu*, furnishes another change from

from the *G* to the Labials *V*, *W*, &c., as *Guerre* becomes *War*, and as *Wench* or *Qwench* belongs to *Gunaik* or *Gunk*. This change is universally acknowledged. Hence, then, we may expect to see the same ideas under the Elements GL, GLC, &c., and BL, BLC, &c. &c. We shall not wonder therefore to find the following terms for *Lac* in the dialects of the Celtic: *Blith*, *Bloχd*, *Lait*, *Lath*, &c. &c. (Lhuyd sub voce *Lac.*) Hence we have *Milk* in English, in Irish *Meilg*, as written by Lhuyd. In Greek we have other forms of these words, as GLAG-*os*, *Glax*, (Γλαγος, Γλαξ, Lac.) In Latin and Greek we have for the verb *Milk*, as we know, *Mulgeo*, and *aMelgo*, (Αμελγω) We should not imagine, that *Sol* belonged to *Lux* and *Light;* but we shall now readily understand from this process, SL, GL, SLC, GLC, or *s*LC, *gLC*, LC, how these words pass into each other. Thus I find, under *Lux*, in Lhuyd's Dictionary, *Golou*, *Golug*, *Glus*, *Solus*, *Lhyg=ad*, *Les*, *Leos*. We see how *Golug* or *Glug*, and *Glus*, *gLug*, *gLus*, become *Lug*, *Lus*, *Lux*, &c. &c. The name of this illustrious Celt, *Lhuyd*, belongs to *Floyd* or *f*LHOYD, &c. &c. &c. In short, we may observe, that all the words, which begin with *L*, appear with the same idea under the Element GL, BL, *g*LC, *b*LC, &c. &c. &c., together with other organical additions to the L. The point, however, which forms the object of the present enquiry, is, that the sound of C, D, &c. is a perpetual adjunct to the L; and that when we have already a Nominative in L, it is not necessary to seek for another Nominative with the addition of C, &c. to L, in order to obtain that C, &c. in the Genitive.

The PARTICIPLES in Greek and Latin follow, as we know, the analogy of the Nouns; and in these Languages, and in various others, they belong to the Elements ^N, ^NS, and ^S, ^T, &c., denoting *This* or *That* Being. We have seen, that in Greek, OON, OUSA, ON, ONT=*os*, &c. (Ων, Ουσα, Ον, Οντος, &c.) is the participle of the verb of Being, and that it is joined with the part expressing

expressing the action of the verb, in order to form the ordinary Participles, as *Tupt*}OON, OUSA, ON, &c., (Τυπτων, τυπτουσα, τυπτον.) We have likewise seen other forms, *As*, *Asa*, *An*, *Eis*, *Eisa*, *En*, &c., (Τυψας, τυψασα, τυψαν, τυφθεις, τυφθεισα, τυφθεν,) &c. &c., which I have before explained. In *Esom*=EN-*os*, (Εσομενος,) and in participles following the same analogy, we have again the EN. In Latin we have ANS, ANT, AT, as in *Am*=ANS, *Am*=ANT-*is*, *Am*=AT-*us*; and in the Gerund *Am*=ANDI, &c. we have the AND. In English we have the same Elements ^N, &c. ^D, &c. denoting Being, as *Lov*=ING, *Lov*=ED; and in old English we have *Lov*=ENDE, *Lov*=ANDE. In the Saxon and Gothic participles we have *Lufi*-ENDE, *Am*-ANS, and *Luf*-OD, *Am*-AT-*us*, *Sokj*-ANDS, *Quær*-ENS, and *Sok*-IDS, ITHS, *Quæs*-IT-*us*. In other Languages, connected with these, we have the same fact, as in the German *Lob*-END-er, A Person *Lov*-ING, and *ge-Lob*-ET, *Lov*-ED. In the Irish Dialect of the Celtic, ^TA, ^TE form the Passive Participle, *Gon-aim*, I wound, *Gon*-^TA, *Wound*-ED; and in Galic, TE is used, as *Cruinich*-TE, ^*Assemb*-ED. In the Hindostan Dialects, TA and KA are added to the part denoting the action of the verb, in order to express the Present and Preterite Participles, as *Dour*-TA, *Dour*-KA, Running, Having Run. In the Armoric, the Passive Participle ends in ET, as *Meuli*, To Praise, *Meul-Et*. In French the Participle active ends in ANT, as *Parl*-ANT; and the Passive Participle appears under the form of the general Analogy, in such instances, as *Instruire*, To Instruct, *Instru*-IT, *Instruct*-ED; *Traire*, To Milk, *Trai*-^*T*, *Milk*-ED; *Craindre*, To Fear, *Crain*-^T, *Fear*-ED, &c. &c. In ETÉ, belonging to our Element ^D, ^T, &c., we see at once the idea of the *Being*, as it appears in the corresponding forms, denoting the Passive Participle, *Lov*-ED, *Am*-AT-*Us*, &c. &c. In Italian the office of the Active Participle is performed by the Gerund, as it is called, *Aim*-ANT, (Fr.) *Am*-ANDO, (It.); and this will shew us, that the ^ND in the Latin Gerunds is only a different form of the

termination

termination of their Participle ANS, ANT. In the Passive Participle the Italian follows the form of the Latin *Am*-AT-*o*. In Spanish we have *Cant*-ANTE, *Cant*-ANDO, *Sing*-ING; and *Cant*-ADO, *Sung*.

In the Persian Language, " the Participle Preterite is formed " from the Infinitive by changing ن" n, " into ه" h, " as رسیدن" *Rs*-ID*h*, " *Arriv*-ED, پاشیدن" *Pash*-ID*h*, " *Sprinkl*-ED." (Jones's Gram. p. 45.) Or we might say, as the regular Persian Infinitive ends in یدن *Idn*, which is added to the part expressing the action of the verb, that the Persian Preterite Participle is formed by adding ID*h* to the part expressing the action of the verb. " The " Participles of the Present tense are formed by adding ان ا or " ندہ" AN, A, or ND*h*, " to the Imperative," or to what may be considered as the Radical part of the verb, " as رسا رسان and " رسند" *Rsa*, *Rs*-AN, *Rs*-ND, " *Arriv*-ING," (Id. p. 49.) In Russian, one form of the present Active Participle is *Chtchie*, as *Moliou*, Je prie, *Molia*-CHTCHIE, *Priant*. My Grammarian represents the sound of a Russian letter here used by *Chtch*. The Gerunds likewise end in *Ioutche*, &c. The Participles Passive sometimes terminate in ^NE, and ^TE. We shall admire this coincidence in the form of the Participles, which so generally prevails; and we shall not doubt, I trust, that the ^T, ^D, ^N, ^ND, &c. are significant portions, denoting Being. The Participle in the Russian Language is sometimes formed by adding *Bchie*, as *Bedaile*, Je voyais, *Bedai*-BCHIE, Ayant vu; where the BCHIE denotes Being, and belongs to the Russian verb of Being, BOUIDI, *Etre*. If it be so, it performs precisely the same office, which I imagine the ^N and ^T, &c. to do under other Elements, in the same situation. We have seen, that the *Boudi*, denoting Being, belongs to a race of words under the Element BD, which are to be found through the whole compass of Language.

We

We shall own, I imagine, that no idea can be more probable, than the hypothesis, which I have proposed, respecting the origin of the terminations in Latin and Greek Nouns, &c.; namely, that such terminations were originally Articular or Pronominal additions, which were Demonstrative of the object specified. Now it is curious, that in one Dialect of the Celtic, the Article is acknowledged to be familiarly *post*-fixed to the noun; just as I have supposed in my hypothesis. In the *Basque* or *Bascuenze* Dialect, *Jaun*, a Lord or Sovereign, becomes in the Nominative Sing. and Pl., when declined with the article, *Jaun*=AC. General Vallancey has shewn us the parallel terms to *Jaun* in different Languages, as the Irish *Tiarna*, the Greek and Latin *Turannos*, (Τυραννος,) *Tyrannus*, the Chaldee *Tarn*, *Torn*, and the Manx *Cheerna*. Thus we see that the Ac in *Jaun*=Ac is nothing but the Os and the Us of *Turann*=Os, and *Tyrann*=Us. To these words belongs our Surname TIERNEY. This circumstance in the construction of the *Basque* Dialect is so striking, that we should be inclined to enquire, whether the origin of the Greek and Latin forms of Speech is not to be directly referred to the *Basque* Dialect, or to some form of the Celtic more particularly belonging to it, in which this peculiarity exists. The Sanscrit Language is acknowledged to bear great affinity to the Latin; and we find in the Hindostanee Dialects, that EEK or AK is the article corresponding with the Latin HIC—the Basque Ac, &c. &c. The EEK is prefixed, as EEK *Ghoorau*; and KAU, KAY, KO, SAY, &c. are added to Nouns, under the idea of what Grammarians would call Prepositions, in order to decline a word, as *Sauheb*=}KAU, KAY, SAY, Of, To, From the Master. Now perhaps the ^KAU, KAY, &c. were originally derived from AK, the Article, as once adopted for a *post*-fix to Nouns. This I must leave for the consideration of the Sanscrit Scholars.

In other cases of the Basque declension, the articles AR and EN, belonging

belonging to other Dialects of the Celtic, appear to be added, and generally in combination. The addition to *Jaun* in some of the other cases are as follows: Jaun=}Ar=En, (Gen. S.) Ari or Ar=En=*Tzat*, (Dat. Sing.) Ar=Eg=Uin, or Ag=Aite, or Ag=Abe, or Ag=An, (Abl. Sing.) En, or Ena, or En=Ac, (Gen. Pl.) En=*Tzat*, (D. Pl.) Acq=Uin, or Ag=Atie, or Acg=Abe, or Et=An, (Abl. Pl.) I have divided these additions, according to the mode, in which, as I conceive, they are compounded. General Vallancey, who has produced the forms of this word, (Essay on Celtic Language, p. 48.) has justly observed, that "In this example, "*Jaunagabe*, and *Tiarnaibh*, (Ir.) and *Jaunagan*, and *Gan Tierna*, " (Ir.) seem to have little affinity, yet, are they absolutely of the " same radix." Nothing can be more certain than their affinity; and yet, as we see, they appear on the first view totally remote from each other. Let us mark the general analogy of ^B in the Ablative case, as in Latin, *Nub*=Ib=us, &c. &c. In the *Ag=An* of the Basque Dialect, we seem to have the composition of Ac and An; and thus the familiar *Gan* of the other Celtic Dialects might be supposed to be directly taken from *Ag=An*, or *a*=Gan, by the loss of the *a*. Yet *G^=An* may be, as I conjecture in another place, a composition taken at once from the form *G^* and An; and thus perhaps we should consider the Basque *Agan* to be quasi *Ac=G^=An*, a triple compound. The *tZ=At* is the same compound as in the Irish *Si=Ad*, S^=*Ud*, &c., " That, There, Yonder." I cannot help observing, that in the Hindostanee Dialects, *Saat*, denoting *With*, is familiarly applied to Nouns in the Ablative, as the other prepositions are to different cases. This is curious, as the terms *tZat* and *Saat* are connected with kindred cases, the Dative and Ablative. We should conjecture, I think, that *Sa=At* was derived from *Say*, " From, by, which," as my Grammarian explains it, who in another place thus interprets Sa, " By, from, with, out of, " than." (Hadley's Gramm. p. 23, and Vocab. 35.) The Say, or

Sa,

SA, in its preposition state, precisely corresponds with the Celtic SA, which Mr. Shaw explains by "In, In *The*;" where we see, in the interpretation THE, its original idea. We shall not wonder at this resemblance between the Hindostanee Dialects, and the Celtic forms of Speech, when we learn, what has been asserted, that a Russian, passing through a street in London, was enabled to understand two Irish women, talking their own Language, from his knowledge of the Hindostanee Dialects. Though few, I imagine, are more deeply impressed with the radical and particular resemblance, existing between the Celtic forms of Speech, and the Hindostanee Dialects, &c., still, however, I cannot but marvel at this narrative; as the Irish and Hindostanee Languages do not appear to resemble each other in those points, in which that degree of affinity consists, supposed in the narrative.

The Composition of PRONOUNS, *&c. and their Derivatives.*

Pronouns, &c. and their Derivatives in a compound state, some of which correspond with certain cases of Articular or Pronominal Parts of Speech, in a state of Inflexion.	
TH^=IS, TH^=AT, quasi THE=IT.	TH^=OUGH, TH^=EM, TH^=EIR, TH^=ERE, TH^=ITHER, TH^=ENCE, TH^=AN. (Eng.)
TH^=OSE, TH^=ESE, TH^=US,	THE, THEY--*Em, Hither, Hence.* (En.) terms in a simpler state.
TH^=AT, TH^=ATA, TH^=*Æ*S, TH^=IS, TH^=OS, TH^=AM, TH^=AIM, TH^=*Æ*RE, TH^=ONE, TH^=ANA, &c. (Cases of the Sax. and Goth. Articles.)	

WE cannot proceed a step in these discussions, without turning our attention to the mode by which the familiar Articles,

Pronouns, &c. are found in a state of combination, as arising from more simple forms; and I have accordingly commenced my enquiries by shewing the nature of the composition which exists in the Saxon, the Gothic, Latin, and Greek Articles. This conducted me to a survey of the compound state, in which Nouns appear in these Languages, and in kindred forms of Speech, by the process of termination and inflexion.—I shall now continue my observations on the composition of Pronouns, &c. in various Languages, and shew through what a wide sphere this operation has been extended,—in a manner, about which our Philologists have formed but little conception in their enquiries on Human Speech. It is indeed marvellous to observe that strong propensity, which exists in the mind to combine Pronouns with each other, in order to render the expression more forcible, as it might be *This=This*, *That=That*, Being or Thing. The very terms which I have been obliged to adopt, *This* and *That*, are themselves compounds of two Pronouns, bearing a similar idea, as The-It. The compounds in English, directly presenting themselves to our attention, either as Adjectives, or as other parts of Speech, which were originally Demonstrative, are *This*, *That*, *Those*, *These*, *Thus*, *Though*, *Them*, *Their*, *There*, *Thither*, *Thence*, *Then*, *Than*, &c. &c. The above words I consider to be compounds, derived immediately from the process of Inflexion, by the composition of The, and the Elements ^S, ^T, &c. ^R and ^M, signifying Being. They are, in fact, different cases of the Saxon and Gothic article in a state of Inflexion, or they are terms directly derived from them. The forms of the Saxon and Gothic article, to which the above terms belong, are *Th=At*, *Th=Ata*, *Th=Æs*, *Th=Is*, *Th=Os*, *Th=Am*, *Th=Aim*, *Th=Ære*, *Tho=Ne*, *Th=Ana*, &c. &c.

The English *That* and *This* are acknowledged to belong to these articles, and to a Saxon Demonstrative Adjective This, Theos, This, corresponding with *Hic*, *Hæc*, *Hoc*. The Saxon and

and Gothic Articles are acknowledged to be Demonstrative Adjectives. The Etymologists refer *This*, to the Saxon Adjective *This*, and the German *Dieser*; and Skinner observes, "Nescio an "liceat deflectere nostrum *This*, à Lat. *Is*." It is marvellous, that our Etymologists should not have unequivocally and distinctly seen the nature of the composition. *That* is referred to the Saxon *Thæt*, the ancient Teutonic French *Thaz*, the Belgic *Dat*, the German *Das*, the Islandic *Thad*, and the Gothic *Thata*. Skinner has placed THAT, *Ut*, the conjunction, by itself, as a different word from THAT, the Adjective, which he refers to *Thæt*, (Sax.) *Dat*, (Belg.) *Dasz*, (Germ.) We see, in the term *That*, the different uses of the Demonstrative part of Speech, as the Relative and the Conjunction: '*That* is a thing *That* is of so 'much consequence, *That* it ought to be done.' The explanatory word *Ut* is, in fact, the second part of the compound *Th*^=AT, and belongs to ID, (Lat.) IT, (Eng.) as I shall shew in a future page. In Scotch, AT not only signifies, "*Th*^=AT, Which," as an Adjective, but likewise as a Conjunction. In Scotch they say, "*That* AT;" and we sometimes find, in old English, "AT *That*." (See Dr. Jamieson's Dictionary, sub voce.) This Lexicographer has produced the parallel terms in other Languages or Dialects, as AT, (Dan.) AT, AD, (Island.) AT, (Swed.) Id. ATT, (Su. G.) a conjunction corresponding to Lat. *Ut*, AT, (old Eng.) Till AT, i. e. Till *Th*^=AT.

The terms TH^=OSE, TH=ESE, directly correspond in case with *Thos*, and *Thas*, the Nominative Plural of the Gothic Article, and of the Saxon *Thas*, the Demonstrative Adjective. In THEY we have the simpler state, before it is compounded with the ^S. In Saxon and Gothic we find the article THE in its uncompounded state, in the Nominative Plural, as THA, THAI, THO; and THY and THE in Saxon are used for all cases, both as an Article and Pronoun. The Etymologists refer THESE to the Belgic *Dese*, the German

German *Diese*, the Swedish *Dess*, the Islandic *Thesser*, and the Saxon *Thas*, and THOSE, to *This*, (Sax.) *Diese*, (Germ.) which is right; that is, they all belong to each other, and perform the same office of Demonstrative adjectives, under minute differences of form. Skinner observes on the word *Those*, and its parallels, "fortean à Lat. Hos vel Eos." The Latin Hos and Eos represent the second part of the compound in *Th*^=ESE, and *Th*^=OSE, and may be considered as more directly belonging to the Gothic EIS, IZE, signifying *They* and *Them*. Skinner refers THEY to the Saxon *Hi*, Illi, and the German *Sie*. In the German SIE we have the simpler form, as in THEY; but perhaps the Latin and Saxon *Hi*, and the Latin *Ii*, should be considered as vowel *breathings*. The Latin *Ii* may however be quasi *Ij*. The term THUS is only another form of *This*, and means 'in *This* manner.' Skinner derives it from the Saxon *Thus*, and the Teutonic French *Sus*, *Sic*, which are only different forms of each other. Let us mark the Latin SIC, which is a compound of a similar kind, quasi SE=IC. It is the same composition as HIC-CE, in a contrary order CE-HIC. It is exceedingly curious, that the Etymologists should have understood something about the mode, in which this word has been formed.—Vossius derives *Sic* "à *Si* cui additum *Ce*," or from *Hic*, "spiritu in *s* converso." I shall shew, that *Si* means likewise *This*, and that it precisely corresponds with the English So, 'in 'This manner,' as SI vis, 'So you like it;' or, as it is said in common colloquial Language, 'If *So* be you like it.'

THOUGH is nothing but *This*—or *That*, or *Thus;* and the term just produced, *So*, or 'If *So*,' may often be substituted for it; "THOUGH I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it "profiteth me nothing." 'So, *So* be it, or If *So* be, I give my body 'to be burned,' &c. In the phrase 'So be it,' we precisely see the sense of THOUGH—'Should the thing be done *So*' or *Thus*—or in *This* manner—namely, 'Should I give my body to be burned.'

In

In Greek, the term corresponding to *Though*, in the passage above quoted, is a word signifying *If*, as Εαν, Si. The parallel terms to *Though*, produced by the Etymologists, are the Saxon *Theah*, *Tha*, the Runic *Tha*, the Gothic *Thauh*, *Thauh*-gaba, the Belgic and German *Doch*, which they explain by " Tamen, Etsi, " Quamvis." These all belong to the same idea, and in some we see the simple form T^, as THA. The Saxon THA is employed at once, as the English *The*, the article, as the Demonstrative and Relative THA=^*T*, and as the Adverb and Conjunction, 'Tum, Tunc, Quum, Quando, Dum, Donec;' though the Adjective and the Adverb are placed under separate heads by Lye. We see in *Etsi*, the explanatory term of *Though*, the SI, If or *So;* and I shall shew, that *Et* is nothing but *Id*, in *This* or *That* manner. We know, that the English *Though* is sometimes expressed in writing by *Tho*, and so it is spoken. The form *Tho* is commonly regarded as a contraction, which may perhaps be the case; yet it may possibly be the representation of the more simple form. In Scotch, *Though* is written *Thocht*, *Thoucht*, as it is represented by Dr. Jamieson. In the same column of this Writer's Lexicon, where *Thocht* is, we have *Thof*, bearing the same meaning; and in vulgar English we have the same sound, "*Thof* a thing be so and so." The *Thof* belongs to *Though*, for the same reason as the sound *Ruf* belongs to *Rough*. Dr. Jamieson derives *Thocht* from *Thought;* and he imagines, that the compound *Allthocht*, *Although*, is quasi '*All* 'being *Thought* of,' or taken into account. He observes, however, that *Thocht* seems allied to the Islandic " *Thoett*, Quamvis; " which, according to G. Andr. is per syncop. for *Tho-At*, from " *Tho*, Licet, etsi; Lex. p. 266." Here, we see, is some glimpse of the true origin. In old English, the simpler form T^, as THA, THEI, &c., occurs, which Dr. Jamieson observes. In Percy's Reliques, to which this Writer refers, we have THA for *Though;*

and

and we have likewise THA for *Them.* The Editor of these Reliques is however wrong in supposing, that THE *God,* in' the ancient ballad on the Victory at the battle of Agincourt, is a contraction for the *The he*, or *The high God.* The term *The* is nothing but the article according to the usage of the Saxons, somewhat different from our own, " THE God for hym wrouzt marvelously."

The term TH^=EM belongs to *Tham* and *Thaim,* the Dative and Ablative of the Saxon and Gothic articles. TH=EM is acknowledged to be found in the simpler state *Hem,* and it is referred by Skinner to *Heom,* (Sax.) *Hem, Hen,* (Belg.) *Dem,* (Ger.); and *Heom* he refers to *Eum,* (Lat.) The HEOM and EUM represent the simpler form, belonging to the Element ^M, and TH^=EM is the compound. We now see, that the EM, "I love EM," is not contracted from *Th*-EM, but it is the primitive form. The Element ^M supplies the Singular and Plural HIM and EM, and so it does in Saxon and Gothic, *Him,* (Sax. Dat. Sing. and Pl.) IMMA, IM, (Goth. Dat. Sing. and Pl.) This the Etymologists understand. In Hebrew and Arabic, as we have seen, HEM signifies They, EM. The English THEIR and THERE convey the idea of *These* Men, &c., and *These* Places, or *That* Place, agreeing with the form of the Saxon article *Thære* and *Thæra,* which mean *That* or *These.* THEIR may be considered as more directly belonging to *Thæra,* (Gen. Pl.) of *Those* people, as ' *Their* gift, the gift ' of *Those.*' Lye, under *Their,* refers it to the Swedish *Deras;* and under *Hem* he observes, "Quod ad *Them* et *Their,* nullus dubito, " quin ab Isl. *Theim, Theirræ, Theyr,* proficiscantur." Skinner derives *Theirs* from the simple form *Hiora,* Illorum; though he seems unconscious, that TH^ in this word is derived from THE. He has justly seen, however, that *Hiora* belongs to *Eoru-^M,* (Lat.) The Etymologists under *There* refer us only to the adverbs bearing that form, as *Ther, Thar,* (Sax.) *Thar,* (Goth.) *Daer,* (Belg.) *Der,* (Dan. and Su.) Ibi, Illic, *Thar,* now written *Dar,* (Germ.)

(Germ.) &c., to which we must add the Greek DEURO, (Δευρο.) Let us note the explanatory term *Illic*, which, we know, belongs to *Ille*, just as I suppose *There* to belong to *Their*, denoting *These*.

It is marvellous to observe, how darkly the Etymologists have viewed such facts, so manifest, as it should seem, and unequivocal. Lye has placed in two separate heads the Saxon *Thær*, in the first of which he considers the term as belonging to the article *Seo*; and in the second he regards it as an adverb signifying "*Ibi, Illic.*" Under the first head, likewise, he places *Thær-to, There-to*, which he supposes to be a compound of the Dative Singular, *Thær* and *To*. Under the same division he produces *There-of, There-on*, &c. &c.; and yet we have another separate head for *Thær, There*, "Ibi, Illic," the adverb, just as if the adverb *There*, and the same term *There*, in the phrases *There-to*, did not belong to each other. Dr. Jamieson, however, is on the brink of discovering this great mystery; and he has accordingly observed in his Dictionary, under the Scotch *Thair*, "used in composition like E. *There*," that he is "*much inclined* "to think, that A. S. *Thaer*, ibi, in that place, was originally "the genit. or abl. of the article; as Lat. *Illic*, and *Istic*, have "been formed from *Ille, Iste*." In the first part however of this article he observes, on Johnson's derivation of *Thereabout*, from *There* and *About*, that the "E. adverb *There* does not seem "properly to enter into the composition." In the same column of Dr. Jamieson's Dictionary we have "THAI, THAY, pron. pl. "of *He* or *She*;" on which word this Etymologist observes, "Johns. gives A. S. *Thi*, as the origin of E. *They*. But *Hi* is the "A. S. word. This seems from *Thaege*, like the pron. *Tha*, "*Thay*." I have derived THEY from *Tha*, the Nominative Plural of the Saxon article, because *Tha* is used in a plural sense, as *They* is. This however is an unnecessary minuteness. Dr. Johnson

is

is equally right in supposing it to belong to *Thi*. The Saxon *Thi*, or, as it is commonly written, *Thy*, and *The*, are used for every case of both numbers. All these belong to each other, and to a great race of words, as we have seen, which appear in their simple state with a vowel breathing after the T^, &c. It was not necessary for Dr. Johnson, though THEY may be considered, as the Plural Pronoun of *He* and *She*, to seek for that identical word in Saxon, as a parallel term, which in the arrangements of a Saxon Grammar is represented as the plural of a Pronoun, corresponding with *He* and *She*. If the Saxon *Hi*, however, has been derived from the consonant form, quasi *T-hi*, they belong to each other; but if *Hi* is only a vowel breathing, they do not.

In the same page of Dr. Jamieson's Dictionary we have another article, "*Tha, Thay, They*, pron. These; all pron. in "the same manner," &c. &c., which the Lexicographer refers to the Saxon *Thaege*, Illi. One article was sufficient, as the Doctor will now understand, for the same word, *Thai, Thay, Tha, Thay, They*, with the same meaning—that is, for the Demonstrative part of Speech, signifying *These*—Persons or things, in different cases, &c. &c. The Saxon *Thaege*, like the English *These*, is in a compound state. In Scotch, *Thir* signifies *These*, corresponding in form and sense with *Their*, (Eng.) *Thære, Thæra*, (Sax.) &c. &c.—By corresponding in *sense*, I mean, that they bear the same fundamental meaning of *This—That—These—Those*, &c., as Demonstrative adjectives. Such is the affinity which I am endeavouring to illustrate, and this is all the affinity which we can expect to exist. Our Etymologists, however, appear to have lost every idea of affinity, when words, by passing through various Languages, have been used with these differences of relation, which Grammarians distinguish by the names of Case—Gender—and Number. When words are used as different parts of Speech, and

and when a term, which is a Demonstrative Pronoun, as Grammarians would call it, has been applied as a Demonstrative Adverb, the gloom thickens, and all is darkness and confusion. It is thus, that in the English *Their* and *There*, which appear under a minute difference of form, all ideas of affinity have been obliterated; and even in the Saxon *Thær*, These, This, Person and Thing, and *Thær*, These Places, That Place, no clear and decided conceptions of their identity or affinity appear to have been formed. Again, in Scotch, THO signifies "Then, At That time," and THO, "These," which Dr. Jamieson has placed in separate articles. THO, we perceive, means *That* (At *That* time,) and *These*, both in the Singular and Plural. THO, as Dr. J. has justly observed, occurs in our old English writers, under the sense of *Then;* and he properly compares it with the Isl. *Tha*, and the Su. G. Dan. *Da*, Tum, Tunc. In German, DA signifies, At *That* time, or *There;* and it is used, likewise, for *When*, *While*, &c. &c., in which sense it means, At *That* time, *That*. It is used, moreover, with *Wer*, *Who*, "Wer DA glaúbt," &c., which my Lexicographer properly translates by "He *That* "believeth," &c. Dr. Jamieson justly compares THO, These, with the Gothic and Sax. *Tho*, *Tha;* and he adds, "THO, how-"ever, *seems* synonimous with *Thai*," before produced.—I shall not stop to exhibit the various terms of this sort, which are to be found in old English, and the Teutonic Dialects, under minute differences of form and meaning; as the Reader will at once be enabled, from the clue now before him, to arrange them in their due places, and to adjust their true and original meanings.

Compounds of the Elements ^T=^R.

HITH=ER, &c. OTH=ER, EITH=ER. (Eng.) *Or*, OD=ER, ATH=OR, OTH=ER, &c. (Eng. Germ. Sax. &c.)

UT=ER. (Lat.)

ET=ER-*os*, ET=AIR-*os*, *Ek*=AT=ER-*os*. (Gr.)

TH^=ITH=ER, T^=OTH=ER. (Eng.)

D^=EUT=ER=*os*, TH^=AT=ER-*os*. (Gr.) Secundus, Alter-Uter.

N^=EUT=ER, N^=EITH=ER. (Lat. and Eng.)

C^=ÆT=ER-*us*. (Lat.)

AT=AR, AUT=AR, AT=ER, EITH=AR. (Gr.) Sed, *Cæterum*, *This—That—Oth=Er* thing.

EITA, (Gr.) *That—Then*.

THE English TH^=ITHER is a compound of *The* and *Hither*, *Hider*, (Sax.) *Hidre*, (Goth.) HITH=ER is a word of the same kind as OTH=ER, EITH=ER, and their parallels, which are compounds of the Elements ^T and ^R, bearing the same meaning. The English T^=OTH=ER is a similar composition to *Thither;* and the Greek words D=EUT=ER-*os*, (Δευτερος, Secundus,) TH^=AT=ER-*os*, (Θατερος, Alteruter,) are formed in the same manner. To this form of OTH=ER and EITH=ER, we must refer the Greek ETER-*os*, (Ετερος,) the ATER-*os*, in *Ek*=ATER-*os*, ETAIR=*os*, (Εταιρος, Sodalis,) which in a simpler form is ET=*es*, (Ετης, Socius;) the Latin UTER, with its derivatives, *Ne*=UTER, *N*^=EITHER, and the compound *C*^=ÆTER-*us*. In UTER=*Que*, UTER=*Cun*=*Que*, we see the propensity of these terms to be united with each other. Some Etymologists have seen the connexion between *Uter* and *Eteros*, (Ετερος.) In the UT, *That*, we have the first part of UT=*Er*. The Latin

Latin terms *Uter*, the Bladder, a Bottle, &c., and *Uterus*, the Matrix, the Belly, &c., are of doubtful origin. We shall agree, that these words belong to each other, under the idea of the *Swelling out* form; but the difficulty is to decide, from what notion they are derived. If UDDER and OUTHAR, (Ουθαρ, Uber, Mamma, præcipue belluarum,) and UTER-*us*, belonged precisely to the same notion; we might suppose, that they were derived from *Uter*, one of *Two*, *This* or *That*, and were originally applied to the *Two* Mammæ of Women. Yet, Vossius has observed, that UTER*us* comes from *Eetter*on, (Ηττερον, Matricis integumentum,) or he might have referred it to the familiar word EETR*on*, (Ητρον, Imus venter, pars ab umbilico usque ad pubem.) It certainly seems, as if the UTER=*us*, and the EETR=*on*, (Ητρον,) belonged to each other; and these words would duly connect themselves in form and meaning with USTER=OS, (Υστερος, Posterior,) which I have before produced, (page 231.) and USTER*a*, (Υστερα, Vulva, *Uterus*, Matrix,) a term derived from it. From *Ustera*, (Υστερα,) we know, is taken our word *Hysteric*.

I have shewn, that EESSA, or EETTA, (Ησσα, Ηττα, Adversum prælium, *Inferiores partes*,) in the sense of the *Lower part*, belongs to our Element ^S, as denoting the EST*ia*, (Εστια,) or *Ground*. I have expressed my doubts, respecting the words under the form ^TR, whether they belong to the Element ^T, or TR, or to both Elements, by the process of composition. Surely the EET in EETTA and EET=*r-on*, (Ηττα, Ητρον,) must belong to each other, as denoting the *Lower part*. The EETR*ion*, (Ητριον, Stamen;—Textum,) and EETR*on*, (Ητρον, Imus venter,) are certainly only different forms of each other, whatever may be the precise idea by which they are connected. An adjacent word EETOR, (Ητορ, Cor,) might perhaps belong to the EETR-*on*, (Ητρον,) as being an important part in the *Venter;* though the latter term is said to be particularly applied to the '*Imus* Venter.' The notions, however,

on

on such subjects, are confused and indefinite. I have suggested, likewise, in another place, a different derivation, (page 188.) While I am examining the Greek *Outhar*, (Ουθαρ, Uber, Mamma, proprie belluarum;—Ubertas, feracitas, Pars agri maxime fœcunda,) I cast my eyes on Oud*os*, Oud*as*, (Ουδος, Solum, Pavimentum; Humus, Terra,) where we are directly brought to the Spot, supposed in my hypothesis. The Oud in these words must surely be considered as attached to our Element; though I cannot determine, whether the *Dos* and *Das* be significant, as belonging to the Element DS, which conveys the same idea. We must refer, I imagine, Outh-*ar* to Oud-*os*, (Ουθαρ, Ουδος); and we must remember, that the former word has a similar meaning to the latter, when it denotes "Pars *Agri* maxime fœcunda;" as in the *Outhar Arourees*, (Ουθαρ Αρουρης.) Perhaps the Ar in this word, and possibly in the others, Eet=^R-*on*, (Ητρον, Imus venter,) may belong to the ^R in Ar=Oura, Era, (Αρουρα, Ερα,) denoting the Ground.

The terms Atar, Autar, Ater, Eithar, (Ατας, Sed, Cæterum, Αυταρ, Sed, Autem, Cæterum, Deinde, Ατερ, Sine, Citra, Extra, Ειθαρ, Statim,) mean nothing but Other—*This*—*That*—Other thing to be added, in order to form a conclusion. The fundamental idea annexed to Ater, (Ατερ,) the adverb, *Without*, is the same, as that which is annexed to the other words, though with an application somewhat different. The sense of this adverb Ater, (Ατερ,) *Without*, is derived from the notion of any thing, being placed in *This*—or *That* Spot, as distinguished or separated from another. The Reader will perhaps imagine, that the desire of supporting my hypothesis has led me to conceive combinations of ideas, which were never united. That this union of ideas exists, will however be evident from the explanatory term, adopted by the Lexicographers,—*Citra*, which actually means, we know, in the first sense, "On *This* Side;" and in the second sense, "*Without*,"

"*Without*," as R. Ainsworth explains it. EITHAR, (Ειθαρ, Statim, confestim,) means, 'Upon *That*,' as we express it; and we have the simpler form in EITA, (Ειτα, Postea, deinde, tum,) *Then*—at *That* time. The Etymologists produce, as the parallel terms to *Other*, the Saxon *Other*, *Auther*, *Nathor*, *Neuter*, corresponding with *Neither*, *Autre*, French; and they add, moreover, the Italian *Altro*, and suppose, that these words all belong to the Latin *Alter*. Skinner however says, "Alludit Gr. Ετερος, quod *Mer.* "*Cas.* pro Etymo habet." The French Etymologists likewise refer *Autre* to *Alter*, which perhaps may not be so; though in such examples it is extremely difficult to decide. They refer likewise *Outre*, anciently written *Oultre*, to *Alter*, which appears more probable. In Spanish, we have *Otro*.

The Etymologists have justly produced, under *Other*, the German *Oder*, Sive, from which our word *Or* is derived, as the Etymologists acknowledge. Skinner cannot avoid seeing, that *Oder* has some relation to the Greek Αταρ, and Αυταρ. The Etymologists refer *Either* to the Saxon *Egther*, compounded of the Preposition *Æc*, Etiam, says Skinner, and *Thær*, Postea; and he adds, "Alludit Gr. Ετερος." If this process be exact, *Either* does not so immediately coincide with the nature of the formation in ETER-*os*, (Ετερος); but still the ^R in all these words appears to have the same meaning. I have shewn, that *Thær*, *There*, is a compound of T^, *The* and *Here*. The Saxon OTHER, *Other;* Alius, Alter, means likewise "*Vel*,"—"Twa men OTHER thre, Duo "homines, aut Tres." The Etymologists produce the parallel terms to *Or*, as the German *Oder*, the Islandic *Edur*, the Saxon *Athor*, *Outher*, *Other*, *Oththe*, the Gothic *Aiththau*, *Uththau*. The Saxon *Oththe* is explained in Lye by "Vel, Aut, Sive;—Usque "ad;" where we see both senses of *Or* and *To;* and from whence we learn, how these ideas may be connected with each other. Let us mark the explanatory Latin word AUT, which has a similar

similar meaning of *This* or *That;* and we now perceive, how AUT and AD may belong to each other. In Gothic, *Uththan* means *Autem*, where we have other forms conveying similar ideas. While I am examining the term *Other*, I cast my eyes on the word *Otter*, the animal; which appears in various Languages, as *Oter*, (Sax.) *Odder*, (Dan.) *Otter*, (Germ.) &c. &c. These terms the Etymologists have referred, and probably with truth, to the Greek *Udor*, (Υδωρ); and they might have added the English *Water*, &c. They justly remind us, that in Greek the animal is called Ενυδρις, and we shall therefore probably acquiesce in this idea as the true derivation. Yet I cannot help suggesting, that the *Otter* might possibly belong to *Other*, under the idea of the amphibious animal—the animal belonging to an-*Other*, or second Element; and I must observe, that this creature appears to have been particularly selected among the amphibious animals, as a creature of an uncertain kind, which excited doubt in the mind, whether it should be arranged to *This* Element or to *That*—to *One* race or to an=OTHER. We all remember, that Falstaff compares the Hostess to "an OTTER;" on which the Prince says, "An OTTER, Sir "John, why an OTTER? *Fal.* Why? She's neither fish nor flesh; "a man knows not where to have her."

Before I quit the term *Other*, I must note some of the words produced as parallel to it by the Etymologists, as *Anthr*, (Goth.) *Anner*, (Run.) *Ander*, (Germ. and Belg.) *Anden*, (Dan.) which they appear to consider as belonging to *Another*. These words seem to be precisely the same composition as that, which exists in the Greek ANEER, ANER=*os*, ANDR-*os*, and the ANTHR in ANTHR-*opos*, (Ανηρ, Ανερος, Ανδρος, Ανθρωπος); and the difficulty is to determine, whether such terms are compounds of *An* and ^R, or of *AN*, and DR. It should seem, by the German *Ander*, as if the composition was *An* and *Der*, the article; and the Gothic *Thar*, commonly used for *That*, as applied to Place, or as signifying *There*, would bear the

the same meaning. Thus the English YON=DER would be a composition of the same kind, which literally means YON=THERE, or *That*=THERE, as we express it, Man, Place, &c. Yet in the Runic *Anner*, and the Greek *Aneer*, the *D* or *T* does not appear; and this might lead us to suppose, that the D or T was only an organical addition to the ^N. Perhaps in some the composition may be *An*, and the Element ^R; and in others AN, and the Elements T^=^R, combined, as in *Der*, *There*, *Thar*, &c. &c. &c. The German Language supplies a term familiarly in use, belonging to the Element ^R, as ER, He, from which the second part of the compound *D*^=ER is formed; so that *D*^=ER is nothing but DIE=ER, if we consider DIE as representing the simple state of the article, without regard to the accidents of gender, &c., to which DIE is applied. In English, likewise, as we have frequently observed, the ER is used familiarly for *Being*, as a termination for words denoting the agent, as *Sing*=ER, *Play*=ER. This use of the Element ^R is universal.

Compounds of the Elements T^=^N.	HENCE, HEN, HIN, &c. HINC. (Eng. Sax. Germ. Lat. &c.)
	TH^=AN, TH^=ONNE, D^=ANN, &c. (Goth. Sax. Germ.) *Th*=*En*.
TH^=EN, TH^=ENCE, TH^=AN. (Eng.)	T^=UNC, D^=ON=EC, T^=EN=US, HAC=T^=EN=US, (Lat.)

TH^=ENCE, TH^=EN, TH^=AN, may be considered as belonging to each other, and as bearing the same fundamental idea of *This—That*. They coincide with the forms in the Saxon and Gothic Articles, *Thone*, *Thana*. A simpler form of *Th*^=*Ence* has been acknowledged

acknowledged to be found in *Hence;* as it is supposed to be derived from *There—Hence.* In HENCE we have the simple form, corresponding with the Saxon *Hine*, the Gothic *Ina*, the Accusative Masculine, *That* Man, which belong to the Latin *Hunc, Hanc.* Our word HENCE means nothing but *That*, as 'From HENCE arose,' 'From *That* arose.' The Latin *Hinc* is acknowledged to belong to *Hunc.* The Etymologists produce the parallel terms to *Hence*, as *Hen, Henen*, (Belg.) *Heonan*, (Sax.) *Hin*, (Germ.) which Skinner derives from the Latin *Hinc.* It is true, that these words all belong to the Latin *Hinc*, as they do to *Hunc* and *Hanc;* yet they are more directly to be referred to the kindred terms in their own Dialects. SINCE, with its parallel terms *Sint*, (Germ.) *Sind*, (Belg.) *Sinth*, (Goth.) *Sedan*, (Swed.) &c., is supposed to be derived from *Sith=Thence.* These words may be compounds of *Sith*, and the Element ^N, or they might at once belong to the Element S^=N. In *Sin*, (Sax.) Suus, and its parallel terms *Sein*, (Germ.) &c., we have the compound *S^=^N;* and in the Saxon *Sin*, Semper, there is the same union. The preceding word to this latter term in my Saxon Dictionary, is *Sin* pro *Synd*, Sumus; where we have a composition of a similar kind, applied to a different purpose. Whether *Sith* be a compound, I cannot decide.

TH^=EN is justly interpreted by the Latin T^=UNC; and we shall now understand, that they are only different forms of each other. The T^=EN, in TEN-*Us*, to *That* point, is a similar compound; and the Us is the same addition as in Us-*que.* In HAC=T^=EN=Us, we have still a further compound; and here we see the HAC, the congenial term. D^=ON=Ec is a conjunction, with a similar meaning to T^=UNC, and it means 'To, or Till 'TH=EN, or *That* time.' The Lexicographers explain it by "Until.—As long as, while *That;*" and they derive it from *Dum* and *Nec.* In *Donic=um*, or *Donec=Cum*, we have a further compound with *Cum.* In Gothic, we have compound conjunctions, belonging

belonging to the article THAN, *That* Person, under the same form, and directly attached to it. The succeeding term to the Gothic "THAN pro *Thana*, Τον," says Lye, is THAN, "ΟΤΕ, οταν, Cum "Quando;" and in the same opening of his Gothic and Saxon Dictionary, I see the Gothic THANDE, "Εως, Dum," and THANDEI, "Επει, Quando, Quum." The Etymologists refer THEN to the parallel terms, *Than*, (Goth.) *Thænne*, *Thonne*, (Sax.) *Dan*, (Belg.) *Dann*, (Germ.) which Junius derives from Οταν, *per aphæresin*.

We should imagine, on the first view, that the term used in comparisons, THAN, is very remote from any idea, which belongs to a Pronoun. I do not find the term THAN in the Lexicons of Skinner and Junius; as they conceived, perhaps, that it coincided with *Then*, which however does not manifestly present itself to the view. It is true, indeed, that they do coincide; and in Saxon the term *Thonne* means at once *Tunc*, and "H, Quam," as Lye explains it. This union of ideas between the particle, if I may so call it, of Comparison, and the Pronoun, does not, as I have observed, at once appear evident; yet we cannot but note, that in the Latin and Greek H and *Quam*, the same union exists. It will be owned, I imagine, that the Saxon *Thonne*, Tunc, Quam, belongs to *Thone*, the Article, 'That person;' and thus we shall understand, that '*Betere* THONNE, *Better* THAN,' meant originally 'Better THONE—Better *That*—*He*—William, Thomas,' &c., i.e. 'Better *That* person, as compared with William, Thomas,' &c.; and afterwards it passed into the idea, which we annex to THAN, the term of comparison, 'Better THAN William, Thomas.' In Spanish, French, and Italian, the terms for comparison, THAN, are derived from the same source of the Pronominal part of Speech, as *Que*—*Che*, which signifiy, we know, *That* Person, *That*, Esto es major QUE estotro, 'This is better *Than* the other,' *Plus Pauvre* QUE *riche*, *Piu povero* CHE ricco, 'More poor *Than* rich.' In Italian, when the Pronominal part of Speech, which we call

the Relative, is not applied, another species of the Pronoun, the Demonstrative adjective, or Article, is adopted, as in the Saxon and English *Than*, as *Piu chiaro* DEL *sole*. The English *Than* and *Del* precisely agree with each other, except that *Than* is taken from what is called the Accusative case, and *Del* is called the Genitive. The Latin *Quam* belongs to the Accusative. In German, *Dann* corresponds in sense and form with *Then*. In this Language, *Als* has a similar meaning: 'Es ist better *Als*, 'It is better *Than*.' My Lexicographer explains *Als* by "As, like. "—*Da*, When, as, when as, at the time That—Mehr Als, More "*Than*;" where in the *As*, signifying in *That* Manner—"at the "time *That*," we see the genuine idea. The German *Als* belongs to the Element ^L, denoting *This* or *That* Being—thing, &c., as *Ille*, (Lat.) *Il*, (Ital. and Fr.) &c. &c. The English As is supposed to be derived from the German *Als*, by the loss of the *l*, which may possibly be so; yet it may belong to our Element ^S, bearing the same meaning, with the Gothic and Latin Is, He, &c. &c. &c., which I rather conceive to be the fact. The German *Als* has been referred to *Alle*, *All*, &c., which is right. *All* belongs likewise to the Element ^L, denoting *Each*, or *Every* person. Let us mark the explanatory term *Each*, which the Etymologists have referred to the Saxon *Elc*, the Belgic *Elck*, &c. &c. *Each* might belong to our Element ^C, bearing the same meaning; yet it is probably derived from the source, which the Etymologists suppose. *Elc* must be referred to the Element ^L, and to the words before us, *Als*, &c. Meric Casaubon derives *Each* from EK-ASTOS, (Εκαστος, Unusquisque,) where in the EK and AST we have the ^S doubled. In EK-EIN-*os*, (Εκεινος,) we have a compound of the Elements ^S and ^N. In Scotch, *Als* signifies *As* and *Also*. The *Al* in *Also*, we see, has the same meaning—*All* or Entirely in *This* manner—*So* or in *This* very manner.

QUI, and its corresponding terms in composition, or the Elements Q^, &c. ^S, ^N, &c., combined with each other.

QU=IS, QU=ID, QU=OD, QU=IC=QU=ID, QU=IC=QU=AM, QU=IS=QUE, QUI=C^=UN=QUE. (Lat.) &c. &c. &c.

WHO — WHY, quasi QWHO, QWHY. (Eng.)

QUHA—QUHAY. (Scotch,) Who.

Wh^=At, *Wh^=Ose*, *Wh^=Om*, *Wh^=En*, *Wh^=Ence*, *Wh^=Ere*, *Wh^=Ether*, *Wh^=Ither*, quasi QWH^=AT, QWH^=OSE, QWH^=OM, &c. &c.

Hwa, *Hw=Æt*, *Hw=Æs*, &c. Cw=As, Cwo, &c. Cw^=Is, &c. &c. (Sax. Goth.) Who.

QU=ANT-*us*, T^=ANT-*us*, QU=OT, QU=OT-*us*, T^=OT, T^=OT-*us*. (Lat.)

QU=AM, T^=AM, QU=UM, T^=UM, &c. (Lat.)

I SHALL consider in this article the compounds of QUI and its parallel terms. The Relative, as it is called, performed originally the office of a Demonstrative part of Speech, *This*—or *That*—*Such* a Person, thing, &c.; and accordingly we find, that QUI signifies "Any;—Every one, all." In English, as we know, *That* is both the Demonstrative and the Relative Pronoun; 'That is a person, 'That all respect;' and through a great variety of Languages, the Articular or Demonstrative parts of Speech are expressed by the same term, as every one understands. We have seen, through what a wide sphere of Human Speech our Element C^, &c., with the breathing after the Radical Consonant, furnishes the Relative Pronoun; as *Qui*, (Lat.) *Chi*, *Che*, *Cui*, (Ital.) *Que*, *Cujo*, (Span.) *Que*, *Qui*, &c. (Fr.) *Cia*, *Ce*, *Se*, (Ir.) *Co*, *Cia*, *Ci=Od*, (Gal.) &c. *Jo*, *Kai*, *Ki=^S*, &c. (Hind.) *Koi*, *Kto*, (Russ.) *Keh*, *Ki*, *Cheh*, &c. (Pers.) *Se*, *Seo*, (Sax.) So, Sa}Ei, (Goth.) &c. &c. &c. We understand,

understand, likewise, that *Qu=Is*, *Qu=Id*, *Qu=Od*, are compositions of Qui and Is, Id, and that the other cases supply combinations of a similar kind, as *C^=Ujus*, *Qu=Em*, *Qu=Am*, quasi *Qui-}Hujus*, or *Ejus*, *Eum*, *Eam*, &c. The derivatives of *Qui* are used in various manners, as Conjunctions, &c. *Que*, *Qui*, (How, Why,) *Quia*, *Quam*, &c. The Reader will with difficulty believe, that the Etymologists do not refer *Que* to *Qui*, but derive it from *Te*, (Τε,) *Ke*, or *Kai*, (Τε, Κε, Και.) All these words indeed belong to our Elements T^, K^, under the same idea; yet no one can doubt, that *Que* directly belongs to Qui, and means 'In *This* 'Manner.' R. Ainsworth justly explains it by "*Also*;" and in the phrase "*Que—Que*, Both—And," we have the sense of "In "*This—That* Manner." When *Que* is used as "a syllabical "addition"—*Quis=Que*, we see its true sense, and we mark the propensity of the mind to form compounds with the Pronominal parts of Speech. In some instances, the whole composition consists of Pronouns, or of words derived from Pronouns, bearing a similar meaning; and in other instances, we find different parts of Speech added. The following examples will be sufficient to illustrate the words derived from *Qui*; as *Quis=Quam*, *Quic=Quid*, *Quis=Que*, *Quic=Que*, *Quic=Quam*, *Qui=Cun=Que*, *Qui=Dem*, *Qui=Dam*, *Qui=Dum*, *Quid=Nam*, *Quia=Nam*, *Quia=Ne*, *Quid=Ni*, *Qui=Ppe*, *Qui=Ppiam*, *Quid=Quid*, *Quantus=Quis=Que*, *Ec=Quis*, *Si=Quis*, *Ali=Quis*, *Qu=Alis*, *Qu=Alis=Cunque*, *Qua=Si*, *Quam=Diu*, *Quam=Libet*, *Quam=Dudum*, &c. &c. &c. It is not necessary to enlarge this enumeration; but I shall proceed to remark on the composition of words in English, &c., which are formed from the parallel terms to *Qui*.

Who, as we have seen, is quasi *Qwho*; and in Scotch it is accordingly represented by *Quha*, or *Quhay*. The term *Why* and *How* are quasi *Qhy*, and *Qhow*, signifying *Who*, (if it were used in the neuter sense,) or *Wha=^T*. We shall now understand, that

What,

What, Whose, Whom, When, Whence, Where, Whether, Whither, are all compounds, the first part of which is *Who* or *Qwho;* and that they are quasi *Qwh=At, Qwh^=Ose, Qwh^=Om, Qwh^=En, Qwh^=Ence, Qwh^=Ere, Qwh^=Ether, Qwh^=Ither.* Some of these terms, as *What, Whose, Whom, When, Whence,* may be considered as directly taken from the Saxon and Gothic Relatives in their state of Inflexion, in which state they are compounds of the Relative *Qwho,* and the Demonstrative part of Speech, *It,* &c., as the article is of *The* and the same Demonstrative pronouns, as I have before shewn. These Relatives are thus represented: Sax. Sing. N. *Hwa, Hwæt.* G. *Hwæs.* D. and Abl. *Hwam.* A. *Hwæne, Hwone, Hwæt.* Goth. Sing. N. *Cwas, Cwo, Cwa, Cwe.* G. *Cwis.* Dat. and Abl. *Cwamma.* A. *Cwana, Cwo, Cwa* or *Cwe.* Pl. Acc. *Cwans.* The English *Wh^=At,* or *Qwh^=At,* coincides with *Hw^=Æt, Hw=Æs, Cw=As, Cw^=Is,* and the Latin *Qu=Od, Qu=Id, Qu=Is*; so that *Wh=At,* or *Qwh=At,* is precisely the same combination of the Relative or Interrogative *Who* or *Qwho,* and *It,* quasi *Qwho=It,* as *Th^=Is, Th^=At,* are of *The=It. Whose* or Qw=Ose is a similar composition, though it may be considered perhaps as more directly taken from the Genitive *Hwæs, Cwis*; as '*Whose* 'pen is this?' 'Of whom is this pen?' That *Whose* is directly derived from the Genitive, will be evident from a similar fact in Latin, where *Cujas* and *Cujus* are adjectives taken from the Genitive *Cujus.* The English *Wh^=Om* coincides with *Hw=Am, Cw=Amma,* and with the Latin *Qu=Em, Qu=Am.* They are compounded of *Who, Qwho, Qwi,* and *Him,* with its parallels *Him,* (Sax.) *Imma,* (Goth.) *Eum, Eam,* (Lat.)

We see, moreover, that *When* and *Whence,* signifying *What* time—*What* place, may be considered, as coinciding with the Accusative Gothic and Saxon *Cwana, Hwæna,* a compound of *Who* and *Ina, Hine,* (Goth. Sax.) If we do not refer *Whence* to the Accusative of the Relative, but say that it is derived from *Who*

and

and *Hence*, this comes precisely to the same thing; as HENCE signifies *That*, and belongs to INA, HINE, as I have before shewn. We perceive, that the Latin QU^=ANDO directly belongs to *When*, or QWH'=EN. QU=ANT=us must be referred likewise to this Saxon form, as QU=OT and QU=OT=*us* belong to *Qu=Od* and *Qu=Id*, *Qwh=At*, &c. T^=ANT-*us* and T^=OT, T^=OT-*us*, were adopted with a minute difference of form or composition, in order to mark another turn of the same idea, as *Th^=En* belongs to *Wh=En* or *Qwh=En*, *Th^=At* to *Wh=At* or *Qwh=At*.—The mind at once forms these regular analogies—without effort and without error. QU=AM, T'=AM, QU=UM, T^=UM, are compounds, formed on the same principle; and we shall now understand, that D^=UM, J^=AM, are likewise similar compositions denoting In, or During *That—This* time. We shall now moreover perceive, that D^=EM, D^=AM, the Pronominal affix, IDEM, *Qui*=DAM, must be referred to the same source. This union of *Dem* or *Dam* with Pronouns will most forcibly support my conjecture respecting its origin.

Nothing can be more unequivocal, than that *Cum* or *Quum*, as the Conjunction or Adverb, "When, at *What* time," &c., belongs to the Relative *Qui;* and we should be inclined to believe, that *Cum* the preposition expressed only another turn of meaning, annexed to the same word. The Etymologists derive *Dum* from *Dee*, (Δη); but it is extremely curious, that they have some glimpse of the true origin of J^=AM. Martinius derives it from *Is*, of which the ancient Accusative was IM. In my hypothesis, it is supposed to be a compound, of which the second part is IM, *Him*, *Imma*, &c. *Tam* and *Quam* are supposed by some to be taken from *Tantum* and *Quantum;* though it is understood, that *Tamen* belongs to *Tam*. *Ita* is an adverb belonging to *Id;* and thus we have alike the forms *Item* and *Idem*, corresponding with each other. Hence we see, that *Dem* or *Tem* may equally belong to

to Adverbs as to Adjectives, denoting *This* or *That* Manner. To the same source we must refer the *Tim* as the termination of Adverbs, as *Minu*=TIM, &c. &c., 'In *This* or *Such* a minute 'manner.' *Dudum* is supposed to be derived from *Diu* and *Dum;* and *Diu* is referred to *Die*. This perhaps may be true. We have perpetual occasion to observe, how these terms are combined with each other; as *Jam=Jam, Jam=Dudum*. The Etymologists remind us, under *Diu*, of the Greek DE=EN, (Δην, Diu, Dudum, Pridem,) which is perhaps only another form of *Then*, (Eng.) *Dan*, (Belg.) &c. &c. The Greek THE=EN, (Θην, Particula, Poet. Sane, diu,) is another of these words. To the forms *Wh=En*, or *Qwh=En*, *Qu=Ando*, we must refer QU=IN, the Latin Conjunction; and to the same form we must ascribe the Spanish *Quien*, He who, &c. &c. The Etymologists derive *Quin* from *Qui* and *Ne;* and the *Ne* may possibly constitute the second part of the Compound. It is true, that in some examples the sense of *Not* appears connected with the *Qui*, What; but in others no such meaning presents itself.

The English terms S^=OME, S`=AME, are similar compounds to the Latin D=AM, in *Qui*=D=AM, &c. The Etymologists refer SOME, Aliquis, as an adjective, and as a termination, *Toil*-SOME, &c., to the Gothic *Sums*, the Saxon *Sum*, the Danish *Som*, &c. &c.; and Junius derives them from the Greek *Amos*, (Αμος, Unus, aliquis; —Meus, noster,) Any person. The second part of *S^*-OME, according to my hypothesis, belongs to such terms as the Greek AMOS, (Αμος,) and its parallels *Him*, &c. This Greek word supplies us with another proof of my theory, which supposes, that the Elements, as ^M, &c., denote simply *This*—or *That* Being; and that accident alone operates in annexing the signification of different persons. We here see, that AMOS is applied alike to the third person, and to the first, both singular and plural. Lye explains the Saxon SUM, by "*Qui*DAM, aliquis, unus."—The English *Same* is only another

another turn of meaning, annexed to *Some;* quasi S^=Ame, Se, or The=Him, if I may so say—*That very person.* In Latin, we know, the idea conveyed by Same is expressed by a Pronoun *Is*, and an Affix to Pronouns, *Dem*, which corresponds, as I imagine, with this very word *Same* or *Some*, as *Idem;* and in Greek it is likewise expressed by two Demonstrative parts of Speech, Ο αυτος, *Idem.* The Etymologists refer *Same* to the Saxon *Same*, the Gothic *Samo*, the Swedish *Samma*, the Islandic *Same*, &c.; and Skinner observes, "Nostro *Same* feliciter alludit Gr. Αμα." The Greek *Ama* should perhaps be considered, as belonging to that race of words, to which the second part of the compound *S^=Ame* is to be referred. We must add to the parallel terms of *Same*, the Russian *Same*, 'Lui Même;' and let us mark the French *Même*, anciently written *Mesme*, which is a compound of *Me* or *Mes*, for *Moy*, *Moi*, and *Sme*, denoting *Same*. In Spanish it is *Mismo*, and in Italian *Medesimo*, where the Simo or Same is distinct. I imagine, that the French *Moi* or *Moy* was quasi *Moj;* but however that may be, we have the *Sme*, distinctly denoting Same. Menage supposes, that the Italian *Medesimo* has been formed from the Latin *Metipsissimus.* When *Mesme* is used as an adverb, he derives it from the Latin *Maxime.* In Saxon, in the phrase *Swa* Same, "Item, "Similiter, pariter," we see in Swa, So, *That* Manner, one of the terms, to which the first part of the compound Sa=^*Me* belongs. The Spanish C^=Omo, and its parallels *Come*, *Comme*, (Ital. Fr.) are similar compounds. Menage derives the French *Comme* from *Quomodo*, by this process, *Comod*, *Comed*, and then *Comment.* The *Ent* is an addition of their Pronominal part of Speech *En.* If we say, that these words *Comme*, &c. directly belong to *Quam*, we have a kindred composition, and it is only another mode of conceiving a similar fact.

Again, in Saxon we have Sam, "Sive, Utrum," which means *This* Same, or *That* Same, "Sam hi fæsten, Sam hi ne fæsten, Sive "illi

" illi jejunent, sive illi non jejunent,"—'Should they do *This* thing, 'or *This* SAME thing, namely, fast; Should they do *That* thing, 'or *That* SAME thing, namely, not fast.' This word SAM means, likewise, in composition, what the Latin SEMI does, as SAM=*Cuc*, SEMI=*Vivus*; and in composition it is used for "SAM*od*, Simul "idem scil. valens," says Lye, "quod Latinum *Con*, ut SAM-"*hiwan*, Conjuges," &c.—We now see, that the Latin SEMI belongs to the Saxon *Sam*, and that they both denote the Half, from the idea of a thing divided into the SAME or Equal parts. The Greek *Eemi*, and *Eemisus*, (Ημι, Ημισυς, Dimidius,) may belong to *Semi*, as *Ex*, (Εξ,) to *Sex*, &c.; or it may be the simple state, from which the second part of *S^*=EMI is derived. Thus *Eemi*, (Ημι,) would belong to such words as AMO*s*, (Αμος, Unus, Aliquis,) 'Such a *One*,' or '*One* and the *Same*,' as we express it. This idea is not improbable, as SE in its separate state has a similar force to the SE in SE=^*Mi*, as SE=*Libra*. The SE is referred in that sense to the particle of Separation, SE, as SE=*Grego*, &c. All this is very just; yet SE, as a particle of Separation, means nothing but THE—'In *This* place or *That*—*Here* or *There*,' as distinguished from another place. Under the same form SE, it actually, we know, denotes *Self*—or *Being*—*This* or *That* Peculiar Being, as distinguished from another. In SE=*Orsum* and DE=*Orsum*, the SE and DE mean *This* and *That*. In S^=*Us* we have a compound of SE and of Us, as in *Us*=*Que;* and the Us has the same meaning in *Vers*=Us. The *Um* in *Vers-Um* belongs to the Element ^M, under a similar idea.

While I am examining the word *Eemi*, (Ημι, Semi,) in my Greek Vocabulary, I cast my eyes on other terms, belonging to the Element ^M, which will illustrate the force of my hypothesis, and will shew us, how different Elements exhibit a race of words, which contain similar ideas, as being derived from a similar source. Thus we have EEMO*s*, (Ημος, Quando, Quum,) which belongs to

such words, as Amos, (Αμος, Aliquis,) just as the *Quis*, in the explanatory word 'Ali=*Quis*,' belongs to *Quando* and *Quum*, as being all formed from *Qui*. Again, I find Eem*en*, (Ημεν, Et, Atque,) where in the *Que* of the explanatory word 'At=*Que*,' we again see the point of union, by which it is connected with the other words. In short, we perceive, that Amos, Eemos, and Eem*on*, mean simply *That*, under the three relations of '*That* 'person—At, or during *That* time—In *That* Manner.' I likewise find Eem*ai*, (Ημαι, Sedeo,) To be *Seated—Situated—Placed*, &c., supplying, as I imagine, the original idea, from which these terms for 'This' or 'That *Existing* Being' are derived; just as the very term *Existence* belongs to *Sisto*, and the explanatory word *Sedeo;* and as Is, Est, Esti, (Εστι,) &c. belong to Ist*emi*, (Ιστημι, Colloco,) and Ez=*omai*, (Εζομαι, Sedeo,) according to my hypothesis.

We observe in our Latin Vocabularies, adjacent to the *Qui* and its derivatives, the term Queo, "To be able; to may, or "can;" and we must own, that the verb Queo seems by its form at once to connect itself with Qui, &c., if the sense, which it bears, could be at all reconciled with the idea conveyed by the Relative. On the first view, nothing appears more remote than the meaning of these words; and yet nothing is more evident and natural than their relation to each other, when duly considered. We shall readily admit, that Queo may belong to Qui, when we reflect, that Qui is used sometimes as *Qualis*, *Such* a person, under the idea of being 'Such a person, who is adequate to 'his purpose—Such as—*Can*, or is *Able* to perform any thing.' To this derivation we should find no difficulty to assent, and we shall acquiesce fully in this notion, when we remember, that in a Greek term we have actually the two senses of *Qui* or *Qualis*, and *Valens, Qui potest*, 'One Who, *Such a one—Such as* is *Able*, or who '*Can*,—do any thing,' as *Oios*, (Οιος, *Qualis;* Promptus, paratus, expeditus,

expeditus, idoneus, aptus, accommodatus, *Valens, Qui Potest.*) The Qu in Qu-*Alis* is likewise derived from Qui. The Greek Oios, (Οιος,) belongs, we see, to our Element ^S, to Os, (Ος, Qui,) &c.; and in its union with Te, as Oios *Te*, (Οιος τε, Potens,) we find the Te, (Τε,) adopted in its more original sense, as derived from To, Tee, &c. &c. (Το, Τη, &c.) The, when applied as a Demonstrative part of Speech. When Te, (Τε, Et,) is used as a Conjunction, it still performs the same office of a Demonstrative part of Speech, and means, 'In *This* Manner,' as *Que* does. Thus Te belongs to To, as *Que* to *Qui*. In the Greek Kai, (Και,) we have another form of these words bearing the same meaning. The Etymologists refer Queo to an Eastern origin; and yet Martinius cannot help observing, "Sed *Queo* lubet derivare a Κοιος, "*Qualis;* ut sit quasi *Qualitatem* ad aliquid habeo, quod barbare "dicimus *Qualificatus* sum. Sic et *Pos, Potis* possit esse a Ποσος, "Quantus, id est, magnus, multus." This is extremely curious. We perceive, that our Etymologist has conceived the true idea, though he has sought for it in the remote word Κοιος, when the very same idea exists in the word Qui, which directly connects itself in form and Language with Queo.

The Greek Koi=*Os* may be considered however as quasi Qui-*os*, *Who*. If we suppose with the Lexicographers, that *o*Koi=*os*, *o*Ko=^*S-os*, are put for *o*Poi-*os*, *o*Po=^*S-os*, (Οκοιος, Οκοσος, Ion. pro Οποιος, Οποσος,) we are brought to the same idea; as in that case we must regard the *Poi* and the *Po*, under the labial forms, as directly connected with the form K^, ^Q, just as *Who* is quasi *Qwho* belonging to *Qui*.—The Po=^*S* of the Latins is probably, as Martinius suggests, a compound of the same sort as Po=^*S-os*, (Ποσος,) from *Pe* or *Pou*, (Πη, Που,) and Os-*os*, (Οσος,) which belongs to *Os*, (Ος, Qui.) The union of the Pos with *Sum*, in *Possum*, adds weight to this derivation; as it is marvellous to observe,

observe, how terms derived from the same source connect themselves with each other. The Greek Pa=^*S*, Pa=^*N*, (Παϛ, Παν,) I conceive to be compounds of the Element P^ and ^S, ^N, bearing a similar meaning of '*This* or *That* Person, *Each Person*.' These combinations, I imagine, are directly taken from the Celtic Dialects. In Welsh we have *Pwy*, *Pa;* in Armoric, *Pe*, *Piou*, *Pe*=^*T*, *Pe*=*Hez*, *Pe*=*Hini;* in Cornish, *Puia*, *Pa*, signifying *Who*, What, &c., corresponding with the *Pou*, *Poi*, *Pe*, &c., (Που, Ubi, Ποι, Quo, aliquo, Πη, Qua?) of the Greeks. We perceive, that the *Po*=^*S*, the *Pa*=^*S*, and *Pa*=^*N*, (Παϛ, Παν,) are compounds of the same kind, as the Armoric *Pe*=^*T*, *Pe*=*Hez*, and *Pe*=*Hini*. In Welsh, *Pa* is compounded with *Un*, *Am*, &c., as *Paham*, or *Pa*=*Am*, 'Why, Wherefore,' *Pa*=*Un*, "Which, or "Whether of the two," and *Pan*, or *P*^=*An*, "When, at What "time." The latter word likewise signifies *That*. The Welsh Scholars will now understand, if they are not already aware of this fact, that the *Byn* in *Bynnag* is a compound of *Pa* and *Un*, or *Yn*, and that the *Ag* is an addition belonging to the construction of the Language. This word is perpetually accompanied by its original parts, *Pa* and *Un*, as *Pwy Bynnag*, *Pa Bynnag*, *Pa Un Bynnag*, *Bynnag Pa Un*. — The Latin *Piam* is the same composition as the Celtic *Paham;* and we accordingly see it annexed to words of its own kind—to Pronouns, as in the Latin *Qui*=Ppiam. In *Qui*=Ppe, we have the simple form Pa or Pe.

Combinations

Combinations of the Element Q^, &c. with ^L.

Alius, Ille, &c. (Lat.)

Allos. (Gr.) Another.

Al, El, Il, &c. (Ar. Span. Ital. Fr. &c.) Articular or Pronominal parts of Speech.

Eelik-os. (Gr.) Quantus.

T^=Elik-*os*, T^=Elik=*Out*-os. (Gr.) Tantus.

Ylk, &c. (Scotch and old Eng.) Every, Each.

Th^=Ylk. (Old English,) That same.

T^=Al=*Ka*. (Ar.) This, That, &c.

Qu=Al-*is*, T^=Al-*is*. (Lat.)

Qu=Is=Qu=Iliæ. (Lat.) *Quis—Qualis*.

Qu=El, Qu=Ale, &c. (Fr. Ital. &c.)

Wh=Ich, quasi Qw=Ilch. (Eng.)

Cw=Ileiks, Quh=Ilk. (Gothic and Scotch,) Which.

Wh^=Ilk, Hw=Ilc, Ho=Ilck, W^=Elche. (Old Eng. Sax. Dan. Germ.) *Which*.

Such, quasi S^=Ulch. (Eng.)

Sw=Ylce, Sw=Aleiks, S^=Ulck, S^=Olche. (Sax. Goth. Belg. Germ.)

Wh^=Ile, quasi *Wh^=Ilk*. (Eng.) Which, at *Which*—or *That* time, *Which*.

Quwh=Ile, Quh=Ilis. (Scotch,) *While*.

I shall now exhibit the combination of the Element Q^, S^, &c. with that of ^L, as in Qu=Al-*is*, &c. &c., which is derived from Qui and Al=*ius*. The Element ^L denotes Being, in the most familiar words, through the whole compass of Language, as in the Latin *Alius, Ille*, &c., the Greek *Allos*, (Αλλος,) &c., the Eastern Articular or Demonstrative parts of Speech, *Al*, (Ar. and Heb.) the Spanish, Italian, French *El, Il, Le*, &c. &c. &c. In old English, and in Scotch, *Ylk, Ilk, Ilka*, signify "Every, "Each,"

"Each," which the Etymologists understand to belong to the Saxon *Elc*, Omnis, Unusquisque. An adjacent word to this Saxon term, in Lye's Dictionary, is *Elcor*, *Alias*, *Aliter;* from which likewise we perceive, that the Latin *Alius* and *Alter* belong to these terms. In old English we have *Thylke*, which is a compound of THE=YLK, *That* same. *Ilk* is likewise joined with *One*, as *Ilk=Ane*, in Scotch. In Greek, we have *Elikos*, (Ηλικος, Quantus, quam magnus; quam potens,) which belongs to ILK, *That*—Such a person, as *Qui* means at once "Any one," and "what an one,"—so that it might be interpreted by *Qui*, as it is by '*Quam* magnus.' The ELIK*ia*, (Ηλικια, Statura, ætas;—adolescentia, juventus, ætatis vigor; ætas bello apta, juventus apta bello gerendo,) means the certain *Quantum* (if I may so express it) of size, age, &c., adequate for any purpose, the *Quantum* or *Id*, (staturæ, ætatis, &c.) *Quod* alicui rei sufficit. We have in Greek a compound, T^=ELIK-*os*, (Τηλικος, Tantus,) from TO, TE, &c. (To, Τη, &c.) &c., denoting THE; and ELIK-*os*, precisely of the same kind as *Thilk* is. In T^=ELIK=*Out-os*, (Τηλικουτος,) we have an addition to this compound, from whence we may again learn, how inclined the mind is to compositions of this nature.

It is curious, that in Arabic we have a pronominal composition, of the same Elements and meaning, similar in form to *Telik*, (Gr.) and *Thilk*, though generated perhaps by a different process. This word is *Tsalka* or *Talka*, ذالك تالك, "(Hic, Hæc, Hoc,)" which must be thus unravelled. The term HAZA coincides with the familiar form for the Demonstrative Adjective HIC, Is, &c. &c.; and from the unequivocal connexion between *Haza*, هذا and ذا ZA or TSA, we see how the words, with the breathing before the Radical, pass into those with the breathing after it. Under the word اذا HAZA, in Mr. Richardson's Dictionary, I find the phrase اش هذا ASH HAZA, "What is *That?*" where in ASH, اش "How? "What? What thing?" we have another of these words, used

as

as an interrogative. The preceding term to اش Ash, in Mr. Richardson's Dictionary, is اش Esh, (Pers.) "His, Him," where we see the Element again faithful to its meaning.

In Arabic, Tsa ذا is the familiar pronoun, signifying 'He, 'This;' and in the same Language, ک K or Ka is said to be "an adverb of similitude; signifying *As, like.*" We perceive, that Ka belongs to Tsa, &c. signifying *The*, Such a person. Now the Arabs combine these words, and make another of their familiar Pronouns, as *Tsaka,* ذاک *That;* where Tsa=Ka is a composition of the Element Z^, K^, &c. with the breathing after the Radical, as Tha=^*T* is of the Element T^ and ^T, with the breathing after and before it. This composition of the Arabic term is acknowledged by the Grammarians, who suppose, and justly too, that an additional composition exists in *Tsa=^L=Ka,* "by the insertion of *L* ل," as they express it, that is, by the insertion of their articular or Pronominal part of Speech ال Al, denoting still, He, *This,* or *That* person, which corresponds with the race of words above exhibited, *Alius, Ylk,* &c. &c. Thus, then, in the English *Th^*=Ilk, and the Greek *T^*=Elik-*os,* (Τηλικος,) we have a composition consisting of two parts; and in the Arabic Tsa=L=*Ka*, a composition consisting of three parts, namely, of the same Elements T^ and ^L, and the Element T^ again added. When I compare therefore such compounds with each other, I do not mean to say that these words in their compound form have passed into each other, but that they are generated from the same Radicals, bearing the same meaning. The Relative in Arabic, *Altsi,* الذي or *Allazé,* as Mr. Richardson represents it, *Allaté,* (fem.) is acknowledged ultimately to be a compound of Al ال and ذي *Tsi;* though Mr. Richardson seems to consider it as a triple compound of *Al—Al* and *Tsi.* The other familiar Pronoun in Arabic, هذا Haza, Mr. Richardson explains by "This, (Man, Woman, or Thing.)"

We

We shall now understand, that Qu=Al-*is* may be considered as belonging to Qui and Al*ius*, Ille, &c., as T=Al-is might to Th^=Ilk, The=Ilk. The word Qu=Al-*is* is in fact a compound of the Qui and the Al, with the same meaning, though in a different order, similar to that, which we have in Ali=Qu=*Is*. The English terms *Which* and *Such* may be regarded as belonging to Qual*is*, however remote they may seem from each other in their present form.—We have seen, that the English *Who*, *What*, *Which*, are quasi *Qwho*, *Qwhat*, *Qwhich*.—In the word *Qwich*, the *L* has been lost; so that the genuine form of the word is Qwilch. In the parallel terms produced by the Etymologists, the existence of the *L* is acknowledged. Skinner has the following article: "*Which*, " antiquis *Whilk*, ab A. S. *Hwilc*, Dan. *Hvilck*, Teut. *Welch*, *Welche*, " Belg. *Welck*, *Welcke*, Fr. Th. *Vuelic*, Quis, Quæ, Qualis, q. d. " *Qualicus*." In Lye's Junius we have likewise the parallel Gothic term *Cwileiks*, and the Swedish *Hwilken*. The power of the letter at the beginning of the Gothic word is represented by *Q*, *Cw*, and *Hw*. The Etymologists may be said to understand the origin of these words. Skinner, we see, refers them to *Qualis*, *Qualicus;* and Junius says, " Olim deduxeram ex Ηλικος," and he observes, moreover, that he considered the Saxon *Thyllice*, " Ejusmodi, " talis, tantus," to be derived from *Telikos*, (Τηλικος.) He adds, however, that he afterwards found it unnecessary to seek a Greek origin for these words, when they might be much more commodiously derived from a Teutonic stock; and he accordingly refers us to *Such*, and its parallels *Sulck*. We now see, that whether we illustrate this race of words by a Teutonic or a Grecian origin, we are equally right. The parallel term to *Which* in Scotch is Quhilk, where we have the true form. We have seen, that the simpler state *Who* is expressed in this Language by Qwha.

Among the compounds of *Quis*, we have *Quisquiliæ*, which means " All things that are of no value, or estimation; riff-raff," as

as R. Ainsworth explains it. Obvious, as it should seem to be, that the *Quis*, in *Quis-Quiliæ*, is the Pronoun; Julius Scaliger appears to have been the only person, who has seen this relation. "A *Quisquis*, *Quisquiliæ*. fuit enim quicquid, το τυχον, vile et obvium "forte, non consilio." Others derive it from Σκυβαλον, Stercus, or from the Hebrew קש בל KS BL, "Minutum vile." Surely we shall all agree, that *Quis-Quiliæ* is a compound of QUIS and QUALIS—QUIS-QUALIS *fuerit*, and is a combination of the same force as QUIS-QUIS, used, likewise, as a term of depreciation, "QUISQUIS "est ille, si est *Aliquis*," the first instance produced by R. Ainsworth under the word. To the Latin *Qualis* more particularly belong the French *Quel*, *Quel-Que*, the Italian *Quel*, *Quale*, *Qual=Che*, the Spanish *Qual*, *Aquello*, as *Tel*, *Tale*, *Tal*, (Fr. Ital. Span.) belong to *Talis*, which the Etymologists understand. The Etymologists produce, as the parallel terms to *Such*, *Swylce*, (Sax.) *Swaleiks*, (Goth.) *Sulck*, (Belg.) *Solche*, (Germ.) &c.; and it is curious, that Skinner has seen the true origin of the word, by deriving it from *Swa*, (Sax.) *So*, and *Hwylc*, Quispiam. He adds, moreover, the derivation of *Swa* and *Like;* and Junius produces the Saxon *Thyllic*, or *Thylc*, which he supposes to be quasi *ThusLic*, but which we perceive to be the same compound as *Thylk*.

The English WHILE, and WHILOM, belong to WHILK, &c. &c., and signify 'The Time at WHILK, or *Which* any action is doing or 'was done—at *That* Time *That*, or at *That* Time.' Another form of *While* is *Whilst*. The English WHILE is referred by the Etymologists to the Saxon *Hwile*, Dum, the Gothic *Cweila*, the Belgic *Wiile*, the German *Weil*, Otium, temporis spatium, the Danish *Hwiler*, Quiesco, &c.; and *Whilom*, Olim, Aliquando, to the Saxon *Hwilon*, *Hwilum*, and to *While*. Lye likewise produces *While Ere*, or *Whilear*, Modo, paulo ante, which he compares with

the Saxon *Hwileær.* This combination occurs in Shakspeare. Caliban says,

" Will you troul the catch,
" You taught me but WHILE=*Ere?*"

The same combination perpetually occurs. Let us mark, among the explanatory words above adopted, the Latin OLIM, which is only another form of *Whilom.* The Etymologists cannot help observing, that the *Ol* in this word belongs to *Olle,* for *Ille.* They refer it likewise to the Hebrew עלם OLM, past or future Time. Mr. Parkhurst produces, as derivatives from this Hebrew term, *Whilom,* and *Olim.* The word *Whilom* cannot perhaps be said directly to belong to the Hebrew term, yet the Element ^L has in both the same meaning. *Quwhile, Quhilis,* is explained in Dr. Jamieson's Dictionary by " At times, now, " then, S. *While;* often used distributively.—*Quhile* he, *Qwhil* he, " or S. *Whiles* the tane, *Whiles* the tothir." Let us mark in *Tane* and *Tother* another combination of the Demonstrative parts of Speech, *The=One, The=Other. Whilom* is written in Scotch *Quhylum, Quhilom,* which Dr. Jamieson explains by " Formerly, " some time ago.—Used distributively, now, then," where we manifestly see the sense of *This—That* time, &c.

Um=Quhile is likewise used in Scotch in a similar manner; " Sometimes, at times," the first part of which, *Um,* is derived from the familiar preposition *En, Un,* &c., and not from *Umb,* Circa, as Dr. Jamieson imagines. The Saxon word *Ymbhwile,* mentioned, as this Writer observes, by Skinner, but unknown to to Lye, &c., appears to have no existence. The succeeding word to *Umquhile,* in Dr. Jamieson's Dictionary, is *Umwylles,* Reluctance, which our Lexicographer justly derives from *Un-Willes,* where *Un* is used in its negative sense. In the same opening of Dr. Jamieson's Dictionary, we have *Umbeweround,* " Environed," which he derives

derives from *Ymbe-Hwearf-an*, Circumcingere. The *Um* is certainly the same as the *En* in *Environ;* and *En* has perpetually the sense of 'surrounding or taking *In.*' *Be-Weround* seems to be the same as *Be-Vironed*. The *N* is changed into the *M*, because of the labial B; and so it is in *Umwilles* and *Umquhile*, because of the labial *W*, and of the labial sound *U* or *W*, annexed to Q. Dr. Jamieson will now, I trust, understand, that the compound words in Scotch, beginning with *Um*, which he has derived from *Ymbe*, &c., Round, belong to *Un*, as *Umbeset*, &c. &c. We have in Scotch the phrases "*Umquhile* Brother—*Umquhile* Husband," &c., which mean the former or late Brother, Husband; or, as we express it precisely by the same kind of phrase, 'Her *Quondam* Brother, Husband,' &c.; where in *Quondam*, belonging to *Quendam—That*—Such a Person, we see a confirmation of my hypothesis, that *While*, *Whilom*, belong to *Whilk*, Which, *That*. It is a singular blunder indeed, which Dr. Jamieson has noted in Whitaker, who, in his vindication of Mary Queen of Scots, explains "this term as "signifying *Uncle*." *Quhile* likewise means "Late, deceased," which Dr. Jamieson, though he refers us to *Unquhil*, derives from the Islandic and Swedish *Hwil-a*, To be at rest. He seems totally unconscious, that this word, with its parallels *Quhile*, &c., belongs to the succeeding term in his Dictionary, *Quhilk*, Which.

Dr. Jamieson has another Scotch word, "*Quhill*, conj. Until, S." which he refers to the "A. S. *Hwile*, Donec, Until, Somner, "or more fully *Tha Hwile the*, which seems to signify *The time* "that." He does not however approve of deriving *Till* from *To While;* which, as he tells us, has been conjectured. Whether *Till* is a compound, belonging to this race of words, I cannot decide. Its coincidence in sense with the words now before us would lead us to this conclusion; yet there are some difficulties on the point, which cannot be explained, without a particular discussion on the force of the Element TL. The English *While* is used

used at present in vulgar Language, as it was anciently among our best writers, like the Scotch QUHILL, for *Until*. So in Shakspeare:

" He shall conceal it,
" WHILES you are willing it shall come to note."
(*Twelfth Night*, Act IV. S. 3.)

" WHILES," says Dr. Johnson, " is *Until*. This word is still so " used in the Northern counties. It is, I think, used in this sense in " the accidence." It is curious to observe, how the idea which we annex to such terms as *To* and *Till* connects itself with the idea, which we express by *This*—or *That* place, time, &c. Here we unequivocally see, that WHILE—*Such*—*That*—time, &c. includes within itself, what we express by '*To* or *Till*—*Such*—'*That* time,' &c. I shall shew, in the course of my enquiries, various examples of this union of ideas.

Combinations of the Element T^, &c. denoting THE, and the Elements ^S, ^N, &c.

T^=Is. (Gr.) TH=Is, or Such a person.

T=^INA, DE=INA. (Gr.) Such a person.

TI=^N, TE=^IN. (Greek,) To Thee, TH=^INE.

T^=, OIOS, T^=Os-*os*, T^=OTHI, T^=OTE, T^=OTH=EN, &c. &c. (Gr.)

S=IC, S^=ED, C=IS, S^=US. (Lat.) That.

SE, CE, DE. (Lat.) *That*, THE.

THE Greek TIS, TI=^*S*, (Τις,) is, I imagine, the same compound as the English *Th*^=*Is*, and Th^=^*At*, quasi *The=It*. In TI, (Τι,) we see the simple state, as in TO, (Το,) THE. In *Ti*=^*Na*, (Τινα,) we have the compound of the Inflexion; but in *Deina*, DE=INA, (Δεινα, Quidam,) we have a compound, separate from the operation of inflexion.

inflexion. The *unused* Nominative *Deis*, or DE-IS, (Δεις,) would present us with the form THI=^S. The Grammarians observe on this word, "Pronomen Δεινα non declinatur; genitivi igitur, "et dativi casus ab *inusitato* nominativo Δεις oriuntur." In TI=^N or TE=IN, (Τιν, Τειν, Dor. Ion. et Poet. pro Σοι, Tibi,) we have an unequivocal compound of TU, (Τυ, Tu,) and the Element ^N, as in *Th^=Ine.* The familiar terms for Being in Greek in their simple state under the Elements ^S and ^N, we know, are *Eis*, *Os*, (Εις, Unus, Ος, Qui,) &c. &c., *En*, *En*=OS, (Εν, Ενος.) There is however some difficulty respecting *Deina*, (Δεινα,) which ought to be explained. The Element DN itself denotes *Man* or *Being*, from an idea explained in a former part of my Work, (p. 184-5.) We shall therefore find the name of *Man* under the form *DN*, as in the Celtic Dialects, *Dyn*, (Welsh,) *Duine*, (Ir.) &c. &c.; and it will therefore be sometimes difficult to decide, whether the terms under this form DN, &c. are original or compounds. If *Deina*, (Δεινα,) be not a compound, it must be referred to the Element DN, as denoting Man. The Greek DEIN=*os*, (Δεινος, *Universe*, Qui est in aliquo genere vehemens, excellens, unde *speciatim*, Dirus, Gravis, Solers, Peritus, &c.) must be referred to the Element DN, as the name of *Man;* and it expresses the various and opposite qualities belonging to this extraordinary animal. It is marvellous to observe, how words are attached to their original idea. We all remember in Sophocles, Πολλα τα ΔΕΙΝΑ, κουδεν ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ ΔΕΙΝΟΤΕΡΟΝ πελει. (Antig.)—If DE=INA, (Δεινα,) be a compound, it is precisely of the same kind as that, which we have in *The=One*, which the Scotch combine into TANE. The Greek TEE=^N-*os* is a combination of the same kind, and is not perhaps directly taken from EK=EIN-*os*, (Εκεινος.) We see unequivocally, in EK=EIN-*os*, a compound of the Elements ^K and ^N, denoting Being.

The T^ in Greek is perpetually added to mark the distinction

of

of 'Th^=*Is* or Such a Being,' in opposition to another. In the very opening of my Greek Vocabulary, where *Tee=^N-os* occurs, we have *T^=Eelikos*, (Τηλικος, Tantus, ab Ηλικος, Quantus,) *T^=Eelik=Out-os*, (Τηλικουτος); and we have moreover *T^=Oios*, *T^=Os-os*, from *Oios*, *Os-os*, (Τοιος, Talis, ab Οιος, Qualis, Τοσος, Tantus, ab Οσος, Quantus,) &c., *T^=Othi*, *T^=Ote*, from *Othi*, *Ote*, (Τοθι, Ibi, ab Οθι, Ubi, Τοτε, Tunc, ab Οτε, Quando.) Let us mark the simple state of these words Oios, Os=*os*, Othi, Ote, which all belong to our Element ^S, ^T, &c., and denote *This* and *That*. Let us again note the explanatory terms *Ubi* and *Ibi*, which belong to the Element ^B, under a similar idea. In the same opening of my Greek Vocabulary, where these words occur, I find To=De, To^=Th=En, T^=Oios=De, Toi=Out-os, To=*D^*=Euter-*on*, (Τοδε, Huc, Τοθεν, Inde, ab Οθεν, Τοιοσδε, Talis, Τοιουτος, Talis, Τοδευτερον, Iterum, secundum,) where we have other compounds. The De, (Δε,) meant originally The; and here it is joined with a term conveying a similar idea. In the same opening, where these words are found, we have Toi, (Τοι, "Particula enclitica, quæ aliis "jungitur, Ου τοι, Nequaquam,") where let us mark the explanatory term to Toi, (Τοι,) the Latin *Quaquam*, which belongs to *Qui*, *This* or *That* Being. Wherever we turn our eyes, we still perceive the same proofs of uniformity and consistency in the formation of Languages. Before I quit the term Os=*os*, (Οσος, Quantus,) which we see is directly taken from Os, (Ος, Qui,) I must note the adjacent term Os-*ios*, (Οσιος, Sanctus,) which may mean '*The* Dis-'tinguished Being,'—the Os=*os*, (Οσος, Quantus.) There is however some difficulty on the origin of Οσιος, which will be explained on another occasion.

Let us mark the term *D^*=Euter-*os*, (Δευτερος, Secundus, Alter,) which I have supposed to be a compound of *D^*, *To*, (Το,) and of a term, like *Eteros*, (Ετερος,) *Other*, &c.; so that the whole word signifies The=Other, as *Alter* means, we know, the 'Second,' from the

the same idea. In Saxon, SE=OTHER means the Second; and from this the Greek DE=UTER-*os* seems to be directly taken. In English we have a similar compound, T^=OTHER. I suspect, that Two with its parallel terms is nothing but THE, *That* person—as spoken with reference to a former; just as *Alter* and *Alius* belong to *Ille*, and only signify *Other*, as denoting *This* or *That* Person, distinguished from a former. In Saxon, *Twa*, and *Twe*=^*G-En* denote *Two*; and the latter Saxon word is a compound of *Twa* and the Elements ^G and ^N, denoting Being. Perhaps the *Secund* or *Secun*, in the Latin *Secund-us*, may be directly taken from *Twegen*; though on this point it is difficult to decide. Some of the Latin Etymologists derive *Secundus* from *Sequor*, which is no improbable conjecture; and others from *Secus*.—The term *Secus* is arranged in two articles by R. Ainsworth, who considers it in one case as an adverb quasi *Sequius*, "*Otherwise*.—"Amiss." The word in this sense seems to have no relation to *Sequor*, and yet it appears to connect itself with *Secundus* in the sense of the *Other*. The preposition *Secus* he explains thus: "By, "or Nigh to,—*Secus* viam," where we indeed come to the sense of *Sequor*. On this word it is difficult to decide. It appears to be a compound of *Sic* and *Us*, as in '*Us*=Que.'

The *S*=^Ic I have before supposed to be itself a compound of the forms of the Element S^ and ^C, *This—That*. Cato uses the term *Utrimque Secus*; where the SEC=Us seems to mean, 'As well 'on *This* side as on *That*.' *Secundus* or SEC=*Cund-us* might be derived from *Sec* in its compound state, and *Cund*, denoting Being, as in *Cunque*, *Quis=Cunque*. The succeeding word to *Secus* in Vossius is *Sed* or *Set*, which is acknowledged by Scaliger to be a compound of SE=ET, as *Atque* is of *Ad* and *Que*. This idea is probably just, though not for the reason which Scaliger gives us. I shew in another place, that the SE, the particle of Separation, means THE. The Latin C^=Is and S=Us are only different forms

forms of S^=Ic; and these words, denoting '*That*—Place or 'manner,' may be considered as compounds of Se=Is, Se=Hic, or Ce=Is, Ce=Hic, in a contrary order to that of Hic=Ce. I have shewn, that Se, the particle of Separation, means the same as Ce, '*That* Being, Thing,' as in Se, the Pronoun, '*That* Being.' In the phrase S=^Us-*Que*, De-*Que*, *This* way, or *That* way, we see the original idea; and let us mark the term De, where we have again another form of The, Ce, &c. Let us note likewise a kindred term Que in combination with these words. We see now, that Se, Ce, and De, are only different forms of each other, meaning *That*. The Etymologists derive C^=Is from *Keise*, (Κεισε,) by Apocope from Ekei=Se, (Εκεισε,) where we have another combination similar to Hic=Ce. The term Citra may be a compound of *Cis* and *Tra*, as it is commonly supposed, or the Ci may represent the word in its simple state. In *Ultra* we have a similar compound from *Ille*, as some have imagined. Vossius observes, that *Ultra* means "In *Illâ* parte," just as *Ep=Ekeina* is derived from *Ekeinos*, (Επεκεινα, Εκεινος.) He derives however *Ultro*, for 'Sponte,' from *Volo*, as the Greek Αυθαιρετας comes from Αιρειν. This comparison between *Ultro* and Αυθαιρετως, from *Aut*-os, (Αυτος, Ille,) will shew us, that Ultro belongs to Ille—*This* or *That* person, as signifying what any one does *Himself*,—as of *Himself*, 'independent of others.' The original sense of the word again appears in '*Ultro* Citroque, on *This* and *That* side.' Hence we see, that Ek=Oon, (Εκων, Voluntarius, qui sponte aliquid facit,) is the same as Ek=Ein in Ek=Ein-*os*, (Εκεινος, Ille.)

The English words M^=Ine, Th^=Ine, are compounds of Th^ and M^, Thou and Me, and the Inflexion *Ine* or ^N. In My and Thy, the possessives are in their simple forms. We have seen, that the Element ^M^, with a breathing either before or after the M, or with both, has been adopted, in a great variety of Languages, to express the Pronoun of the first person in some of its

its relations, as *Me*, *My*, (Eng.) *Eme*, *Me*, &c. (Gr.) *Me*, (Lat.) *Me*, *Moi*, (Fr.) *Me*, *Mi*, (Ital. and Span.) *Me*, (Sax.) *Mai*, (Russ.) We; *Ma*, *Am*, (Pers.) We, My; *Me*, *Om*, (Gal. and Ir.) *Mi*, *Ma*, *Am*, (Arm.) *Mi*, *Fi*, (Welsh,) *Mi*, *Vi*, *Evi*, *Am*, &c. (Corn.) *My*, *May*, *Hum*, (Hind.) &c. In these words we have the simple form; but in others we have the compound form, as *Me=Ina*, *Mi=^S*, Of, To Me, (Goth.) *Mi=^N*, (Sax.) *Me=Iner*, *Mi=^Ch*, (Germ.) *Me=^Nia*, (Russ.) Of me; *Ma=^N*, *Ma=Ra*, (Pers.) I, to Me, &c. &c. In the Nominative case, as it is called, the Element ^C, ^G, &c. is sometimes, we know, used, as Egoo, (Εγω,) Ego, *I*, quasi Ig, &c. &c. &c., which I have before produced. The English and Saxon *We*, and their parallel terms *W^=Eis*, *W^=Ir*, (Goth. and Germ.) *W^=It*, (Goth. and Sax.) I consider to belong to the labial Element M^, V^, &c. In *We* we see the simple form; but in the others we have a composition. In Saxon, the genitive case of *Ic*, *I*, according to the arrangement of the Grammarians, is M=In; and in the other cases it is *Me*. In Gothic the cases are (N.) *Ik*. (G.) M=Eina. (Dat. and Abl.) M=Is. (Acc.) M^=Ik; and in German we have *Ich*, M^=Einer, M^=Ir, ^M^=Ich. We here see the compositions of M^ and the Elements ^N, ^S, ^R, bearing the same meaning, as in the compounds, *Th^=En*, *Th=Is*, *Th^=Here*; though the Pronouns do not follow the analogy of the Article, in those peculiar relations, which the Grammarians express by the term Cases. The Latin *Mei* and *Mihi* are probably quasi *Mej* and *Mihj*; and *Tui* is perhaps quasi *Tuj*. We find in Gothic, for the inflexions of *Thou*, (Nom.) *Thu*. (G.) *Th^=Eina*. (D. and Ab.) *Th^=Us*. (Acc.) *Th^=Uk*. In German we have *Du*, *D^=Einer*, *D^=Ir*, *D^=Ich*; and in Saxon, (N.) *Thu*. (G.) *Thin*. (D. Ab. and Acc.) *The*. The parallels to Mine, Thine, as they are exhibited by the Etymologists, are M^=}*Ein*, *In*, *Ein*, *Ien*, *Iin*, (Goth. Sax. Germ. Fr. Belg.) &c. &c., Th^=}*Ein*, *In*, *Inn*, D^=}*Ein*, *Iin*, *In*, *T^=Ien*,

(Goth. Sax. Isl. Germ. Belg. Swed.) The Greek T^={EIN, IN, (Τεῖν, Τιν, Ion. Dor. pro Σοί, Tibi,) must be considered as similar compounds to TH=INE, &c., and probably as directly belonging to them.

The Possessives MINE and THINE are derived, as we perceive, from what Grammarians would call the Genitive. We see, in Latin, how the Possessives *Noster*, *Vester*, *Nostr*-as, *Vestr*-as, *Cujas*, are connected with *Nostr=Um*, *Vestr=Um*, *Cujus*. In English, *His*, *Her*, *Her's*, *Their*, *Their's*, *Your*, *Your's*, *Our*, *Our's*, may all be considered as Genitive cases, derived from the Saxon Genitives HIS, HIRE, of Him, of Her; THÆRA, of Them, Those; EOWER, of You; URE, of Us. We see, in the terms HER, THEIR, &c., as Possessives, 'HER Gown, THEIR Gowns,' the Saxon use of the words "The Gown, or Gowns of HER, "*Them*." In HER*'s*, THEIR*'s*, we see the original sense of the Personal Pronouns HER, *Them*; though the idea of the Genitive is expressed by another analogy, namely, by the addition of the *s*.—We must not be surprised to find in our Old Poets a mode of construction, belonging to these Possessives YOUR, &c., as they are considered by us, which refers to their original sense of *Personal* Pronouns. Thus, in the Poems attributed to Rowley, we have,

> "YOUR lovying wife, *Who* erst dyd rid the londe
> "Of *Lurdanes*, and the treasure that you han,
> "Wyll falle into the Normanne robber's honde,
> "Unlesse with honde and harte you plaie the manne."
>
> (*Battle of Hastings*, N. I. v. 35. &c.)

Here YOUR conveyed to the mind the same idea as '*Of* YOU;' and the meaning is, that "The Loving Wife of YOU, *Who* "formerly drove away your enemies, will now fall into the hands "of the Normans." *Lurdane* is not *Lord-Dane*, as Dean Milles supposes; but it is used as a term of contempt, denoting Heavy, Stupid, Vile, people. The "LORDYING Toad," in the

the Tournament, means the *Lurdane*, the *Heavy*, *Lumpy*, Toad. Dean Milles, under *Lordyne*, justly refers us to the French *Lourd*, and *Lurdin* in Gawin Douglas, which the Glossarist rightly explains by "Blockhead, sot." The *Lord*, in *Lordying*, belongs to *Load*. Hence the Hump-backed man is called *Lourd*, *Lurd*, or *Lord*, as we now pronounce it.

The Persian Scholars will now understand, that the Persian M^=AN, من *I*, is a compound formed of the same materials as the English *M^=Ine*. The Element appears in its simple form in MA, We, and in MA=*Ra*, ME, where the *Ra* is the addition to denote the Case. The Persian Scholars will again mark, that the *Ra*, which is used to form the Dative and Accusative Cases, both in the Singular and Plural, is nothing but the Teutonic addition of Case, originally denoting Person, as we find it in *Th*=ÆRE, *D^*=ER, &c. &c., and in the German *M^*=IR, directly corresponding with it in form and sense. In Persian the plural is formed by adding AN, where we again see the Element ^N, performing the same office, as it does on other occasions. Sometimes *Ha* is used for the Plural. In Persian, as we have seen, AN and AIN ان اين are *That*, *This;* from whence, as we understand, the plural termination is taken. In Hebrew the termination of the plurals is in ^M and ^N, which are derived from the Pronouns EME and ENE, המה הנה signifying *Them*. In the Arabic, likewise, HEM and HEN هم هن signify *They;* and hence in that Language the plurals end in ^N, ان *An*. In English the termination of the plural is sometimes in ^N, as *Ox*, *Ox*=EN. In one declension of the Saxon the plural terminates in ^N, and in three declensions of the Gothic it terminates in ^NS. In two declensions of the German the termination is likewise in ^N. The resemblance of the Persian to the Teutonic Dialects, and particularly to the German, has been perpetually observed. In Persian, *May=An* signifies

signifies 'We,' and *May=An-Ra*, 'To Us.' The Persian MA=RA precisely corresponds, as I have observed, with the Teutonic MI=^R, To Me; and the *May=An-^Ra* is a similar composition to *Me=In-Er*, though formed by a process somewhat different. In Persian, *Tu* تو is *Thou*, and *Sh^=Uma* is You or Ye, which is a compound of *Tu* or *Su*, and *Uma;* where the *Uma* denotes You, as the Greek UM in UM=*eis*, (Υμεις,) does.

The form of the English MINE will remind us of other terms, under the form MN, which are likewise compounds. In Arabic, من MAN signifies "Those Who, He Who;" and the Arabic Scholars understand, I imagine, that this word is a compound of MA, ما the familiar Pronoun in that Language, signifying "That which, Those which," and ^N, denoting Being, HN هن 'They.'—The Arabic من MAN signifies "Some one, any one, a "certain person." We shall now understand, that the Greek particle M^=EN, (Μεν,) the Pronoun M^=IN, (Μιν, Seipsum, Seipsam, Seipsos,) and the English M^=AN, afford precisely the same composition, and signify *Being—Person*. In the ordinary phrase, O MEN, O De, (Ο Μεν, Ο δε,) *This* and *That* Person, we are brought to its original idea. Let us mark the term *De*, (Δε,) which denotes likewise *Person*, and belongs to *The*, *Die*, &c. The first sense of MEN, (Μεν,) in the ordinary Vocabularies, is *Quidem*, which belongs, we know, to *Quidam*, containing precisely the same notion which I have supposed to be annexed to MEN, (Μεν.) Thus we see, that MIN and MEN, (Μιν, Μεν,) have the same relation to each other, as *Quidam* has to *Quidem*. It is marvellous to observe, how certain terms still continue to be connected with other terms, which originally conveyed the same idea. MEN is connected with *De*, *Dee*, *Toi*, *Gee*, *Oun*, *Pou*, &c. (Ο Μεν, Ο δε, Μεν δη, Μεν τοι, Μενουν, Μεν που, Μεν τοι που, Μεν τοι γε,) which belong to the Element D^, ^N, P^, originally denoting 'Being.' We shall now understand, that the particles in Greek have arisen from this source; and we shall not wonder,

wonder, that these particles are sometimes found in clusters; when we perceive, through the whole compass of Language, that there is a strong propensity in the mind to combine terms expressing Pronouns—'*This* or *That* Being—Person, Thing, &c., 'with each other.' We shall find, that these Particles in Greek are particularly combined with Pronouns, as in such phrases as these: '*Touto Men Toi*,' '*Tis Men Toi Toon*,' 'Peri *Menoun* '*Toutoon Tauta*,' '*Kai Tauta Men Dee Tauta*,' (Τουτο μεν τοι, Τις μεν τοι των, Περι μενουν τουτων ταυτα, Και ταυτα μεν δη ταυτα, Atque hæc quidem hactenus.) Let us mark the term KAI, (Και, Et,—Etiam,) which likewise belongs to the same race of words, and means *This*—"In *This* manner." The term *Tauta*, (Ταυτα,) is itself a compound of T^ denoting *The*, and AUT, *It*, quasi TA=AUTA, (Τα αυτα); and thus we see, what a variety of terms, originally denoting *The* or *That*, are crowded into one sentence, KAI TA AUT M^=EN, DEE, TA, AUTA. We see in *Touto*, or T^=OUTO, (Τουτο,) the same composition of T^, *To*, (Το,) and OUT or AUT, in OUT-*os*, AUT-*os*, (Ουτος, Αυτος); and it is precisely the same species of composition, as we find in *Th^=Is* and *Th^=At*, from *The* and *It*, quasi THE=IT.

The English MAN appears more particularly in its Pronoun state, if I may so express it, in the other Dialects of the Teutonic, as in Saxon and German. My German Lexicographer explains MAN by "MAN, MEN, People, They,—*One*, MAN hat "mich berichtet, *One* has told me;—Ihr, *You*, MAN muss wissen, "*You* ought to know" This word will serve to illustrate likewise the main scope of my argument, and will shew us how readily the term denoting *Being* applies itself to all persons. In Saxon, too, *Man* or *M^=AN* is used, as the French ON is, and the English ONE, terms which form, as I conjecture, a part of its composition, as '*M^=AN* brohte, ON a apporté, *M=AN* mihte 'geseon,' ONE might see, or, as we could express it, A MAN might see. MAN is used at present both for *Male* and *Female*,— or the

Being

Being in general, as 'The Creature MAN'—'MAN*kind;*' and in Saxon, *Wundorlic* MAN signifies Præclara *Fœmina*. The words *Fœmina*, *Woman*, *Homin-is*, might be quasi *Fœm*=MINA, Wom=MAN, Hom=MIN-is; and the *Min* or *Man* might belong to MAN, the Being; though the *N* is perhaps only an organical addition to the M. In old English, MAN signifies simply Being, and is applied to another order of Beings, beside that, which we now denominate by the name of *Men*. In Shakspeare's age, the ancient sense remained, though the present sense was then prevalent; and hence our Poet has been furnished with a jest, bordering on profaneness. Dogberry says, "*God's* a good MAN." In the Merry Wives of Windsor, we have "No MAN means evil "but the *Devil.*" Mr. Steevens observes on these passages, that "in the ancient Interludes and Moralities, *the Beings of* "*supreme power, excellence, or depravity*, are occasionally styled "MEN." He produces, moreover, a passage from Jeronimo, "You're the last MAN I thought on, save the Devil." MAN occurs in various Languages, as in the Saxon *Man*, *Mon*, the Gothic *Manna*, the German and Belgic *Mann*, *Man*, the Runic *Man*, the Danish *Mand*, &c., which the Etymologists produce; and they refer us to the Saxon *Mœnan*, the German *Meynen*, &c., the Greek *Menos*, (Μενος,) the Latin *Mens*, and the Greek *Manes*, (Μανης, Servus.) The English MAN, we know, is used as the Greek *Man*-es is for a Servant.

The MAN*es*, Departed Spirits, we shall now understand to be the potent MEN—or Beings. Hence we have, in the Saliarian verses, the "Cerus MANUS," the Great Creating MAN or Being, which is explained by "Creator bonus," and the *Sum*=MANUS, the "Summus MANIUM," a title given to Pluto. The Etymologists understand, that these Latin words belong to each other, though they derive them from *Manus*, the Hand, *Mane*, the Morning, &c. &c. &c. The Etymologists observe, that *Immanis* is derived from

from *Manus*, an ancient word for Good.—MAN*us*, we see, is the *Illustrious Being;* and the MAN in *Im*MAN*is* has the same meaning of the *Distinguished Being*, whether for Good or for Evil. *Immanis* is precisely the same compound as *Ingens*, from *In* and *Gens*, denoting likewise Being. While I am examining the term *Manes*, in the Etymologicon of Vossius, I cast my eyes on *Mandragoras;* which we shall now understand to belong to MAN, from its supposed likeness to the Human form, quasi Ανθρωπομορφος. Some have before derived it from the Belgic *Man*,—an origin, which was of all others the most absurd, according to our former notions on the subject of Etymology. Vossius has therefore justly observed, "At neutiquam audiendi, qui deducunt ex Belg. *Man*, "id est, *Vir*," &c. On the second part of this compound, it is not easy to decide. We have seen in a former page, (179,) that the Element DRG denotes a *Draught*, a Delineation, form, or likeness; and such perhaps may be the force of *Drag* in *Mandragoras*, or *Mandrake*. Hence we have the Persian *Aher*= MAN, اهرمن "A Demon, spirit, giant, satyr.—The Principle of "Evil, in opposition to Ormuzd, the Principle of Good." The *Aher* belongs to the Element ^R, denoting the Illustrious Personage, as in *Hero*, &c. &c. *Or=Muzd* is a compound of *Or*, bearing the same meaning, and مرد *Murd*, "A *Man*, a Hero.—"Dead," to which belongs the Latin *Mortalis*, *Mortal*, &c. The MN in *Berhe*MEN, برهمن or *Brah*MAN, has probably the same force, and is perhaps derived from BR, Great, and *Man*, and not from *Brimha*, the Deity. Yet *Brimha* itself contains the same idea, and is probably a compound of BR, Great, and ^M. Yet, however that may be, *Brimha* belongs to *Primus*,—*From*, *Bremo*, (Βρεμω, Fremo, Murmuro,) *Fremo*, all denoting the First—the Illustrious, &c.—Great—Violent, &c. To *Aher=Man* belongs the Teutonic *Har=Man*, *Herr=Mann*, which directly connects itself, as we know, with *Herr*, the Lord, Master, &c.—*Mann*, the Being

Man.

Man. I shall not pursue to a greater length my observations on the Element MN, under this idea, which is diffused through a wide sphere of Human Speech.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE PRONOUNS IN THE PERSIAN LANGUAGE.

I COMPARED in a former page the composition of the Persian *M^=An*, من from M^, expressing the first person I, and ان این AN, AIN, *This, That.* I might take this occasion of making a few remarks on the Persian Pronouns. We have seen, that ASH اش is HIS or HER, ESH=AN, They, KEH, CHEH, KI, CHI, Who, Which, and Who, What? In هرکه هرانکه *Har=Che, Har=An=Che,* Whosoever, we have a compound of Pronominal parts of Speech, as in *Who=So=Ever;* where we see another compound, formed on the same principles. The AHER in AHER-*Man*, we now see, is the same as the Pronominal HAR. In this Language, خود *Chud* is used as a Pronoun possessive; it answers to the Greek σφετερος, and signifies "*My, thy, our, your, his* or *her*, and *their*, according to the person and number of "the principal Verb in the sentence;" and کس KES means in Persian, "A man, a person, one, any one, some one." The *K=Es* and the *Ch^=Ud* are the same compounds as the Latin *Qu=Is*, the Spanish *C^=Ada*, the French *Ch=Aque*, and the Celtic *G^=Ach*, which I have before produced. On the term کدام KADAM, *Which*, some difficulties occur, which cannot be unravelled, without the knowledge of other Elements. In Persian, چون *Chun* signifies, "1. How? 2. Like, in the manner of, as if. "3. Manner, Quality." This is a compound of *Che* and *An;* and we perceive, that it signifies *Quality* precisely for the same reason

reason that the term *Quality* itself, which is derived from *Qualis*, a compound of *Qui* and the Element ^L, is invested with this peculiar meaning. An adjacent word is چونان *Chunan*, Just as if, where there is another addition of *An*; and in چنانکه CH^=UN=AN=KEH, the *Keh* is again added. The *Chun* is precisely the same combination as that of the Latin *Cun*, or C^=UN, from *Qui* or *Cui*, and *Unus*; and we see in C^=*Un*=*Que*, and QUI=C^=UN=QUE, how these kindred terms are wont to be compounded with each other. I have shewn, that *Quid* or *Quod* is a composition of *Qui* and *Id*; and thus, in QU=OD=C^=UN=QUE, we have a combination of five terms, and the *Qui* is thrice repeated. The Greek K^=EN is a similar compound of *Ke* and *An*, (Κε et Αν); and the KEN, (Κεν,) shews its original idea, when it is connected with Pronouns, as in O, TI KEN Κεφαλη Κατανευσω, where the *Oti* KEN is justly translated by *Quod*=CUN=*Que*.

The Greek conjunctions, AN and EAN, (Αν, Εαν,) denote simply '*That* or *So*,—Should things so happen, or *If So* Be,' as we express it. It is accordingly found, that AN associates itself with Pronouns, and bears distinctly its original sense of a demonstrative part of Speech, corresponding with *Cunque*. Hoogeveen remarks on this Greek Particle, "Maxime vulgaris usus est cum "articulo subjunctivo, cui juncta idem notat, quod Latinorum "syllabica adjectio *Cunque*. Exempla innumera." Hoogeveen then produces a few of these examples, which every where occur, as Α Αν, Οι Αν, Οσ' Αν, Ην Αν, Αιτινες Αν, &c. &c., *Quæ*=*Cunque*, *Qui*=*Cunque*, &c. &c. We cannot help seeing the relation in sense of CUN, denoting 'Quality or *Kind*,' with the word *Kind* itself, and its corresponding term *Genus*. The words *Kind* and *Genus* connect themselves with a great race of words, as *Genero*, *Ginomai*, (Γινομαι,) &c. &c.; and we cannot but note the Latin *Cunctus*, the German *Gantz*, &c., as bearing a strong resemblance

to *Cun*, &c. If these words should all belong to each other, the process of composition will have proceeded to a length, of which we had formed but little idea. On these points however we cannot determine, till the Element CN shall be carefully examined. The Persian Scholars might be inclined to think, from the present view of the question, that the familiar term گونه *Gune*, "Colour, species, form, figure, external appearance," as Mr. Richardson explains it, who in the interpretation of some examples annexed adopts the terms *Kind* and *Genus*, is only another form of *Chun;* and yet they would refer it, I imagine, to *Kind* and *Genus*. In the same column of Mr. Richardson's Dictionary, I see the Arabic كون *Kawn*, "Being, becoming, happening. — Essence, existence," which surely belongs to *Ginomai*, (Γινομαι.) Through the whole range of Language, the Element *GN* denotes Being; and it will afford us a future theme of curious and extensive discussion.

In Persian, AIN=JA, اینجا and AN=JA, انجا mean *Here* and *There*, which are combinations of AN and CHE or JA, in a demonstrative sense; and we have likewise اینسو انسو AIN=SU, AN=SU, Hither, Thither, which are similar compositions. The Persian سو or سوي SU or SUI, means "a Side, a Part.—Towards." The Greek EN=THA, (Ενθα, Hic, Illic) and the French AIN=SI, are combinations formed from the same materials. The French word was sometimes anciently written *En=Sic*, where in Si=^C we have the same combination as in the Latin *Sic*. The French AIN=SI may in fact be considered as a combination of EN=CI. The Greeks again combine their *En=Tha* with *De*, as *En=Tha=De*, (Ενθαδε.) In *Th^=En*, (Θεν,) we have another composition of *Tha*, *The*, (Θε,) &c. and *En*. Again, in Persian, *Ku=Ja*, کجا Where, Whither, is a compound of *Ku* and *Ja;* and they say, likewise, *Har Ku=Ja Keh*, هر کجا که for Whosoever. The Persians, we see, have adopted two forms, ک and جا which my Grammarian

Grammarian represents to an English ear by Ku and Ja, in order to express *What* and *That*. The representation, which my Grammarian has adopted, Ja, This, That, may remind us of a word in French, which happens to be written in the same manner, Ja, *De*=Ja, From *That* time, and which has precisely the same meaning. The French Etymologists suppose *Ja* to be derived from *Jam*. I shew in another place, that Ja=^*M* is itself a compound. They acknowledge however its relation to the Italian *Gia*.

Again, in Persian, Ta تا means Until; and we have seen, that سو or سوي Su or Sui means *To*-wards. We shall now understand, that Ta and Su are only different forms of each other, coinciding with the English To, the German Zu, &c. Mr. Richardson explains the Persian تا Ta, by "TO, Until;" and in the same column of this Writer's Dictionary, we have the Arabic Ta, تا ("The Feminine Demonstrative Pronoun.) "*That* (Woman,)" as my Author explains it; and likewise Ta in the same Language, signifying *By* in swearing, where the word has still the sense of the demonstrative part of Speech — *That*, or The, as تالله *Tallahi*, By God — The — *That* very God. In the same column, we have likewise the Persian Ta, تا "A fold, plait, or ply (of a garment, &c.) — Multiplicity. — يک تا "*Iek* Ta, Simple or single. دو تا *Du* Ta, Double. سه تا *Se* Ta, "Triple;" where Ta still means *That* One — *That* Two — *That* Three — or *That same* quantity taken once, twice, thrice. We have seen, that Tu, تو in Persian, is *Thou* — *That* Being; and in Arabic, again, we have "ذه Tih and Tihi, (Fem. of ذا)" Za, which signifies "*She*, This, He," &c.; and Za, ذا as we have seen, is "He, This. — A Lord, Master, endowed with, &c.," which is supposed to be the accusative of ذو Zu, "A Lord, "Master. — Having, Possessed of, endowed with. — Who." I have conjectured, that *Queo*, To be able, belongs to *Qui*; and we see, in the

the same word Zu, the senses of the two Latin terms *Qui* and *Queo*. In the same column of Mr. Richardson's Dictionary where Za is, we have Zat, "(fem. of ذو)" Zu, "A Lady.—"Possessed of, or Endowed with.—The soul, essence, substance, "nature, the body, person." These forms K^, &c. denoting Man, bring us to the Persian Kai, كي "When.—A great King. "—A strong giant, a genie.—An intrepid Hero;" and this will remind us of the Irish Cia, "How, whence, A Man, "Husband."

OBSERVATIONS ON THE PRONOUNS IN THE FRENCH, ITALIAN, AND SPANISH LANGUAGES.

I shall now more particularly examine the nature of the Pronouns and their Derivatives belonging to other parts of Speech, in the French, Italian, and Spanish Languages, which have not been so minutely considered on former occasions. The examination of the English Pronouns, and a comparison with their parallels, have fully unfolded the nature of the words, belonging to this part of Speech, in the Dialects of the Teutonic. We have seen, that the parallel terms to the Latin *Qualis* are *Quel*, *Quel=Que*, (Fr.) *Quel*, *Quale*, *Qual=Che*, (Ital.) *Qual*, *Aquello*, (Span.) as *Tel*, (Fr.) *Tale*, (Ital.) *Tal*, (Span.) belong to *Talis*. In Ce=Lui, C^=Elle, Ce=La, which are acknowledged to be derived from Ce, *Lui*, *Elle*, and *La*, we have compounds from the same materials. In the French Ici we have the full form of *Ce*, *Ci*, &c., as in the Spanish Assi; and in the ancient Language we have the compound *Icelle*, as in the present *Celle*. The French Etymologists, under Ici, justly remind us of the Greek Ekei, (Εκει,) and Hic=Ce. If Ici is most related to the Latin word, it must be considered as a compound quasi Ic=Ci. Aus=Si seems only to be another form of

of Ici; and here the composition is manifest. The Etymologists derive Aussi from Ουτως and *Ad-Sic.* The Ce, Ci, &c. have precisely the same origin and idea, as the Latin Ce. The word *Ain=Si* was formerly written *Ain=Sic;* where the *Sic* is a compound of *Ci=Ic.* If we consider *Ici* or Ic=Ci as a compound, we perceive, that the Ci=Ic is the same combination in an opposite order. The Ain denotes *That, These,* as in En, &c. *Oui* is quasi Ouj, and means *That*—In *That* manner, as Yes with its parallel terms does. The interjection Ouais has probably a similar meaning, *That!* applied to another purpose.—In Italian we have similar compounds from Cio, *That,* and *Lui,* and *Loro,* &c., as *Co=Lui, Co=Loro,* &c. &c.; and of C^ and the Element ^T, ^ST, &c., as *Co=^Stui, Co=^Stei,* and *Co=^T=Esto,* where the Element ^T is twice repeated. In *Que=^Sto, Qu=^Sti,* we have a similar composition from the form *Que* and the Element ^ST. In Essa, Esso, Essi, She, Him, or It, They, we see the simpler state of the Element ^S, &c., as in Is, Iste, &c. In Sta, *This,* as Sta *Matina,* This Morning, the breathing before the ST is lost, and preserved after it. In Italian too, Sta signifies He *Stands,* or *Is;* and we now perceive, how Sta, He *Stands,* or *Is,* bears the same relation to Sta, That, which *Existit* does to *Existens.* In Ist=Esso, and ^St=Esso, the Same, the Element ^S, ^T, &c. is doubled. Let us here mark, that the idea, which we convey by the word *Same,* is expressed by the union of two Pronouns. In Spanish we have the same simple terms, and the same compounds. Este and Esse mean *This—That,* and Este coincides with the form of the verb Est*ar,* "To be in a place.—To Be, an "auxiliary verb." From these we have the compounds *Aqu=Este, Aqu=Esse,* and, with the Element ^L, *Qual,* and *Aquello:* Where the *A* precedes the Q, the compound seems to be triple, and the *Ag* to be significant, quasi Ag=Que=^LLo.

Among the Spanish adverbs we have Aqui and Aca, Here, or There,

There, and Ac=Ulla, Yonder, which belong to our Element ^C and ^L, and mean *This*—and *That*. Ac=Ulla is only another form of *Aquello*, and the Aca will remind us of the Celtic Accw, (Welsh,) *There*, and the Greek Ekei, (Εκει.) The Ek in Ekei has the same force, as the Ek in Ek-*Einos*, (Εκεινος.) In Spanish, *Alli* means There, as in the French *La*. The *Ahi*, "In *This* Place," of the Spanish, is quasi *Achi*. The *Algo* of the Spanish, the *Alc* in the Italian *Alc=Uno*, and the *Auc*, quasi *Aulc*, in the French *Auc=Un*, belong, we see, to our Element ^L, in its uncompounded state. We see, likewise, the organical addition of C to the L, as in the English *Ylk*, *Else*, &c., and of its cognates K and S. The Etymologists understand, that *Alcuno*, &c. is derived from *Aliquis* and *Unus*. The French *Autre* is supposed to be derived from *Alter;* yet it might belong to *Other*, *Either*, and various terms of the same kind. The Spanish C^=Ada, and the French *Ch*^=*Aque*, seem to be compounds of the same kind, and directly to coincide with the Celtic *Gach*, Each, Every, from which the French name *Gaches* is derived. General Vallancey has justly observed, that *Gach* "is of the same origin as well as signification with the "Cantabrian or Basque *Gucia*, whereof the Spanish *Cada* and the "Latin *Quot* were anciently only a variation of Dialect." (Irish Gram. p. 38.) I have before compared the Spanish *Cada* and the Celtic *Gach* with the Persian خود Chud, the pronoun possessive, کس Kes, Any One, and the Latin Quis. The Zut in the Spanish Zut=*Ano*, "Such and Such a one," might be considered as a compound of the same kind; though it should perhaps be directly referred to the Arabic Zaat, ذات which is the Feminine of ذو Zu, as Mr. Richardson observes, "A Lord, Master.—Having, possessed "of, endowed with.—Who." We see, that Zu belongs to Qui, Che, &c. &c. The ^T, used as the Feminine in Hebrew and Arabic, still means *This*—or *That* Being, so that *Zaat* may still be considered as a compound. Mr. Richardson explains Zaat by

by " A Lady.—Possessed of, or endowed with. The soul, essence, " substance, nature, the body, person." The *Ano* in ZUT=*Ano* is the addition from the nature of the Language derived from *Uno*. But the term *Fulano*, " Such a man," is directly and wholly taken from the Arabic, as the Etymologists acknowledge. In Arabic, فلان FULAN, says Mr. Richardson, " (In Spanish " *Fulano*,) the name of any unknown or undefined person. He, " that man—Mr. Such-a-one." The Spanish *Qui=En*, Who, is a compound of QUI and the Element ^N.

In Italian, CI, CE, NE, NOI, denote *Us;* and VI, VE, VOI, denote *Ye*, or *You*. My hypothesis is, that these terms were originally only Demonstrative words, denoting *This, That*, &c., but were afterwards applied to express different and distinct persons. Now in Italian, CI and VI are used in their original sense to denote *This*— or *That*, Person, Place, &c., as 'CI, VI 'Sono, *Those* Persons, or *Such* Persons Are,' or, as we express it, *There are*. In the phrases " Giacche sono QUI, CI pranzero," QUI and CI are only different forms bearing a similar meaning; " Since I am in *This* or *That* Place, I will dine in *This* or *That* " Place. — Puisque Je suis Ici, J'y dinerai." Again, in the phrase " Sono stato in Inghilterra, no VI tornerò piu,"—" I have " been in England, I will not return to *That* Spot," the word is used in its genuine sense. The French, in the corresponding phrase to CI, VI *Sono*, use terms denoting *It* and *There*, '*Il Y* a.' The Etymologists imagine, that the French *Y*, as well as the Italian VI, belong to *Ibi*. That the Italian VI belongs to IBI, is according to my hypothesis; though it is not easy to adjust the precise degree of Affinity, which they bear to each other. I suppose, that all these words denoting *Being* or Existence, which belong to the Element ^B, &c., are derived from the idea of Place. Now, though IBI denotes *This* or *That* Place, it probably relates to *Place* at once in its original meaning, and not

not to Place, as signifying in a derivative sense *This* or *That*, which I imagine to be the case with Vi. The French *Y*, whatever be the source from which it is derived, signifies simply *This — That — These;* and it is indifferent to what it is applied, whether to Persons — Things, or Places. My Lexicographer explains *Y* by 'To, At, For, In Him, Her, It, Them, — There, 'Thither.' The French En and the Italian *Ne*, which belong to the Element ^N, mean only *This* or *That—These*, and refer to all the Persons. In the Italian the breathing is after the N^, as in the Celtic Article of the Galic and Irish Dialects, we have both An and Na. The French and Italians delight in the combination of these Demonstrative words, Il y En *a;* where we have It — *There* or *That*, (Place,) *They* or *Them* joined together; and in Italian we have Ve ne *Sono*. The French On is only another form of En, applied with the same meaning in another manner. My Lexicographer explains On by "One, They, "People."

We shall now understand, that the Italian and Spanish Si, denoting *Self*, and "Yes, So," &c., have precisely the same meaning applied to different purposes. When it denotes *Self*, it means *That* Being; and when it denotes *Yes* and *So*, it means *Thus* or in *That* Manner. We see, that So in English is only another form of Si, *Yes;* and I have shewn, that Yes has the same idea, when the breathing is before the ^*S*. The Italian Co=Si is a compound of Co and Si, bearing the same meaning as in the French Ce=Ci. In Spanish, French, and Italian, Si, Si, and Se, denote *If*, and correspond with the Latin Si. The ordinary Lexicographers bring the Latin Si to the sense conveyed by this race of words, when they tell us, that Si is used for *Quod;* and R. Ainsworth gives us, as the second sense of Si, "Seeing *That.*" Hence it is, that Si is connected with such words as *Quis*, *Qui*, Si=*Quis*, Si=*Quidem*, &c. &c. It is marvellous

to

to observe how the mind is inclined to combine these words with each other. The Etymologists derive Si from Ei, (Ei,) which I conceive to be quasi Ej, where the breathing is before the Radical consonant. Hence it is, that Ei, (Ei,) is so perpetually combined with particles, as they are called, which originally, as I imagine, denoted Being, or with words, which are acknowledged to denote Being, as *Ei De*, (Ει δε,) *Ei Dee*, (Ει δη,) *Ei Ge*, (Ει γε,) *Ei Tis*, *Ei Tou*, *Ei Too*, (Ει τις, Ει του, Ει τω,) &c. &c. The Latin Si, &c. denoting *If*, precisely corresponds in form with the English So—*That* or *This* Thing, as I have before observed;—'Si me 'audies, gaudebo, So you will hear me, I shall rejoice;' and the sense of the Demonstrative part of Speech is connected in such a manner with the sense expressed by the conjunction *If*, that we unite these words together in our own Language, '*If* So be that you 'will hear me, I shall rejoice.' The corresponding word in German, So, which means "So, *Thus*, after *This* Manner," is used as a Relative, and likewise as the Latin Conjunction Si, "Der mann, SO mir solches gesagt," The man, *That* or *Who* Said it to me, "SO es euch beliebet, *If* you please, *If* such be your "pleasure," as my Lexicographer translates it, who explains this sense of the word by "SO, *If* SO, If SO be *That*," &c.

Sin is a compound of Si and the Element ^N, *This* or *That*. The Etymologists derive it from Si and Ne. This is the same thing. I shall shew, that Ne originally performed the office of a demonstrative Part of Speech. Sin in one of its senses is explained by *Otherwise*, where in *Other* we see the same idea of *This* or *That*. Sine, as it should seem, is the preposition annexed to Sin. The Conjunction Si=^*N* is unquestionably a compound of Si and ^N, and denotes *This* or *That*—So and So, as distinguished from something else—in *This* or *That*—*Other* manner; and Sine the preposition, when it is annexed to a word, means, that the thing or Person, to which it is annexed, is in

An-Other, or in a different state or position to that, with which it is compared. "Non possum vivere tecum, nec SINE te"—"Nec te "existente *Hic*, neque Te existente—*Illic*, *Alio* loco." Martinius has compared SI and SIN with *Alioqui* and *Alioquin*, which coincide with each other in the fundamental ideas annexed to them of *This—That*, Mode, Manner, &c. Let us mark again, how these terms denoting Being are combined with each other, *Alius* and *Qui*. The word QUI^ =N may be considered, as a similar combination to SI=^N, with a minute variation in the turn of meaning. Though the explanation which I have given, as to the sense conveyed by SINE, is, I imagine, the true one; yet there may be some doubt still remaining, respecting the origin of the term. *Sine* may not directly belong to *Sin*, but may belong to the Element ^N, by an organical addition of the *s*, conveying the same idea. We must remember, that ANEU, (Ανευ, Absque, Sine, Præter, Citra,) means *s*-INE; and in German we have OHNE. The Greek ANEU, (Ανευ,) is joined with its corresponding words in ANEU=THE, ANEU=THE=^N, (Ανευθε, Ανευθεν.) In Welsh we have ONI, ONID, and OND, "If Not, Unless, except;" but these words the Lexicographers conceive to be compounds of Os and *Ni*. They imagine likewise, that Os, If, is compounded of O and Ys, which latter word signifies 'Truly,' and which, we see, means YES, 'In *That* or *This* Manner.' Hence the Welsh join it with EF, He, as YS EF, which might be rendered in Latin by IS IP-*se;* and these terms they contract into SEF, says Mr. Richards, who produces, moreover, the phrase "YS EF yw HYNNY, To wit, That "is;" where we have three words, belonging to our Elements ^S, ^F, and ^N, bearing the same meaning of *This* or *That*.

In the Latin S=INGUL-*us*, the *S* may be either an organical addition, or it may be significant. Whatever it be, the composition is Celtic. In Welsh, *Unig*, *Unigawl*, or UN=IG, and UN=IG=AWL, mean *Singular;* where UN=IG is the same compound as

as the Latin and Greek UN=IC-*us*, and EN=IK-*os*, (Ενικος.) The Welsh likewise use *Sengl* and *Tengl*, or *S*=EN=^*G*=^*L*, *T*=EN=^*G*=^*L*, in the same sense. The *S* and *T* in these words seem to be significant portions. The Latin *Singultus* might belong to *Singulus*, under the idea of the 'Single, Distinct, Separate 'Noises,' which succeed each other 'One by One;' or it may belong to the Element SL, GL, denoting Noise. If the latter be the true derivation, the *Singultus* will be quasi *Siggultus*, or *Sgultus*, and the *i* will have arisen from the accidental insertion of a Vowel breathing between the letters representing the first Consonant of the Radical.—The Latin SINO, To Suffer, Permit, &c., may belong to SIN, under the idea of *This* or *That*. It may be imagined, perhaps, on the first view, that the origin, which I have proposed, is remote; but a little reflexion will reconcile us to the idea. One of the passages, produced under *Sino* by R. Ainsworth, is the following: "SINE fores, *Sic*, abi, noli aperiri;" where the word *Sic* will shew us the original idea. 'Let the 'Doors be *So*—in *This* or *That* manner, as they are.' The phrase might have been Sint *Fores* SIC, where SIC conveys the idea expressed by the sentence. Now if SIC had been converted into a verb, and the phrase had been '*Sicce* fores, *Thus* the Doors,' if I may so say, or 'Let the Doors be *Thus*,' it would bear precisely the same idea, as that which I annex to SINE in my hypothesis. Let us mark the explanatory term *Sic*, which is a compound of our Element S^ and ^C, or of such terms as SI, CE, &c. and HIC, as I have before observed.

On the word SINISTER, I am unable to decide. The Etymologists derive it from *Sine Astris*, and it might seem indeed as if *Astrum* was a part of the composition. Whatever the *Ister* means in this word, it should seem, as if the *Ister* in the Greek *Ar*-ISTER-*os*, (Αριστερος,) had the same meaning. Perhaps these words may be compounds of our Elements S^=^N=^S=^R, and of ^R=

^R=^S=^R, denoting *This—That.* We cannot but mark, under the same form with the Sin of the Italian Sin=*Istro*, the particle Sino, Until,—Sino a *Tanto Che—in*Sin*tanto;* where the Sin certainly means *That*, and belongs to the Celtic Sin, That. The Celtic combination *An Tan Sin*, "At that time," is of a similar kind to that of *In=Sin=Tanto.* The term *S*^=In is unquestionably a compound of S^=^N, as the Celtic Scholars would acknowledge, who will now see, that *T*^=An is one of a similar kind from Ti=An, as *S*^=In is from So=An. The Latin *T*^=^Ant-*us* I shew to be likewise a similar species of composition. In the same column of Mr. Shaw's Celtic Dictionary, where Sin, *That*, is found, I see likewise *Singil*, "Single, Alone, unmixed." On the whole, we shall imagine, I think, that the Latin S^=In=Ist=Er is a composition of certain terms, denoting *This* or *That.* I shall not pursue to a greater length my remarks on the composition of S^=^N, as we cannot fully understand this subject, till the Element SN shall be particularly examined.

PARTICLES;

UNDER THE ELEMENTARY FORMS

^C, ^D, &c. and C^, D^, &c.

Particles belonging to the Element ^C, ^D, &c., which originally denoted *This* or *That*.

Hic, Huc, Hic=Ce, Huc=Ce. (Lat.) Here, There, To *This* —*That* point.

Id=*Eo*, Ad=*Eo*. (Lat.) Therefore.

Ad. (Lat.) Quasi Id, To *This* place, point, &c. To, &c.

Us=*Que*. (Lat.)

At, Ast. (Lat.)

At. (Eng.)

Ad, At, Aig, Ag. (Celt.) *At*, &c.

Od. (Hebr.) To, Unto.

Eis. (Gr.) One, *This*, or *That* Person—To.

Oos. (Gr.) As, in *This* or *That* Manner—To.

Eita, *Ep*=Eita. (Gr.) Upon *That*—Then.

Ap=Ud. (Lat.)

Ut, Uti. (Lat.) *That*.

Ita. (Lat.) In *This* or *That* Manner.

Autem, Item. (Lat.) Quasi *Idem*, This or That manner.

Eti—Yet. (Gr. and Eng.)

Ek, Ex. (Gr. Lat.) *That* place, From, By, &c. *That* place.

Ek = { Ast-*os*, =As, At=Er-*os*, Ein-*os*. (Gr.) *This* or *That* person, place.

Ac, Et, At=*Que*, Etiam. (Lat.) In *This* manner, So, &c.

I shall now consider those parts of Speech, belonging to our Element ^C^, ^D^, &c., which have been classed by some Grammarians under the name of Particles, as certain Adverbs, *Prepositions*, and *Conjunctions;* and I shall endeavour to shew, that they were

were originally derived from Pronominal terms, denoting *This—That*, &c. I shall first consider those words, which belong to the form of the Element ^C, ^D, &c. when the vowel breathing precedes the Radical Consonant, either with or without a vowel breathing after it. I shall not anticipate the train of reasoning, which I adopt in my illustration of this subject, as it will best unfold itself, when the examples themselves shall be brought under discussion; yet it may perhaps be necessary to observe, that in one part of Speech, the *Conjunction*, as it is called, the probability of my hypothesis at once presents itself to the mind of the Reader.—The English Conjunction *That*, as every one understands and acknowledges, is a Pronominal part of Speech, at once Demonstrative and Relative, 'That is a subject, That requires 'much consideration, That it may be understood.' We all know, moreover, that a similar union of the *Conjunction* and the *Pronoun* exists in various other Languages, as in the Latin *Quod*, the French, Spanish, and Italian *Que, Che*, the Greek *Oti*, (Οτι, Quod, Quia, Ο, τι, Quod,) &c. &c. &c. In English, and in other Languages, when terms, performing the part of Conjunctions, which are derived from different sources, are adopted; still the Conjunction *That*, and its cognate terms, may be frequently adopted, without disturbing the turn of meaning, which these various Conjunctions are employed to express, as 'Unless *That*'—'Provided *That*'—'If *That*,' &c. &c.—'Pourvu *Que*,' 'A moins, '*Que*,' &c. &c. We shall hence understand, how terms originally denoting *That* might be applied to those various turns of meaning, which the various species of Conjunctions, according to the division of Grammarians, are employed to convey, and which are in fact oftentimes expressed by words drawn from a variety of sources, distinct and remote from each other. My French Lexicographer thus explains the various turns of meaning, in which *Que* is applied: "Que. Conj. 1. If. 2. Unless, without, "before.

" before. 3. When, as, at a time when. 4. Till, until. 5. *That.*
" 6. If, when. 7. Lest, for fear *That.* 8. Than. 9. Where.
" 10. When. 11. Whether. 12. Because. 13. As. 14. How,
" how much, how many. 15. How. 16. Why. 17. What.
" 18. Nothing but, only."

I shall commence my enquiries by considering a Preposition, belonging to the form of our Element ^C, ^D, &c. with the breathing preceding the Radical Consonant; and we shall here see, what all have understood, how words performing the office of Prepositions and Conjunctions, may express a similar meaning, or contain the same fundamental idea, though they are applied to purposes somewhat different. Though Grammarians have with good reason distinguished words, applied to these different purposes, by the different names of *Conjunctions* and *Prepositions*, yet they have not been ignorant, that such words often conveyed a similar sense, and belonged to the same fundamental notion. Every Grammarian who records the fact, which often takes place, that the *same* word is used both as a *Preposition* and *Conjunction*, necessarily supposes this circumstance to exist, as every one allows, that the same word, however various may be its senses, contains one common and fundamental idea. The first term, which I shall examine, is the Latin AD, " To, Before, At—" Until," &c. &c., which meant originally, as I imagine, '*That*—' Place—Time;' and it may be considered, only as another form of ID. The Demonstrative part of Speech, when it is applied to a distant Place or Time, naturally passes into the idea, which we annex to such Prepositions, as AD, signifying *To*. Thus in the phrase 'Eo ID Londinum,' if I may so say, when it becomes familiarly repeated, we readily and almost necessarily pass from the sense of ID to the use of AD—'Eo AD Londinum.' The Conjunction UT, I conceive, likewise, to be another form of ID; and thus we see, how AD and UT contain the same fundamental idea.

idea. We find, among the interpretations of R. Ainsworth for Ad, the term *Until*, and the terms "Till, Until," are adopted, as we have seen, among the senses of a Conjunction. We know, that *Till* and *Until* are used both as Prepositions and Conjunctions—*Till—Until* such a time—*Till—Until* he returns—*Till—Until—That* he returns. In our ancient Writers, and in Scotch, *Till* is familiarly used, as *To* now is in our ordinary Language; and I have suggested on a former occasion, that *Till* may perhaps be derived from a Pronominal word signifying *This—That*, &c.

The Etymologists justly compare Ad with At, Ast, (Lat.) and the Greek *Atar*, (Ατάρ); and they inform us, likewise, that it is compounded with adverbs, as *Adeo*, which is the same, says Vossius, as "Eo usque, Ad eum usque modum." The explanatory English word At is acknowledged to belong to Ad. Let us mark how Ad is joined with a term of the same sort, *Eo*, belonging to Is, Id; and we shall agree, that Ad=*Eo* might have been Ad=Id. The first sense of *Adeo* in Robert Ainsworth is *So*, where we have the original idea, *This—That*—or Such a manner. In the combination *Ad=Huc*, quasi Ad=Hoc, we have precisely the same union, which I suppose in Ad=Id. It is marvellous to observe, how these terms are inclined to be united with each other. Let us again note the explanatory word *Usque*, where the Us has the same meaning of Is—'That;' and we observe, moreover, that it is combined with *Que*, and forms a similar union to that of Huc=Ce. In the phrase *Us=Que Ut*, we have, in fact, the union of terms, denoting in their original meaning, without regarding the primitive sense of *Us*,—'To *That—That;*' and in the combination *Us=Que=Qua=Que*, we have the union 'To *That—That—That*,' applied to a different purpose. In the phrases *Us=Que* Ad=*Eo*, *Us-Que Ad=Huc*, we have the combinations 'To 'That To *That;*' and thus we see, how terms, conveying a Demon-

Demonstrative idea, are crowded together; which will shew us how frequent and prominent this idea presents itself in the construction of Languages.

One of the senses of AD=*eo*, according to R. Ainsworth, is "And "*Therefore;*" and he explains ID=*eo*, which is acknowledged to be derived from ID and *Eo*, "Therefore,—Propera AD*eo* tollere puerum," where we might put "Propera ID*eo* tollere puerum." Now AD and ID, in AD, ID}*Eo*, coincide in meaning. While I am examining the term *Ideo*, I cast my eyes on *Identidem*, where we have another combination—*Idem*—*Idem;* and likewise on *Igitur*, "Therefore.—"Then, Thereupon," where we see the Is—ID. The sense of *Thereupon* is the same as Upon *This*—Upon *That*. The Etymologists understand, that *Igitur* is related to Is; and they derive it therefore from "ID *Agitur*." It may be a compound of ID-ID, or ID-ITA, or the *Itur* may be referred to such terms, as *Autar*, (Αυταρ,) *Eter-os*, (Ετερος,) *Other*, &c. Let us mark the explanatory word ITA, which the Etymologists acknowledge to belong to Is, OUT-*os*, (Ουτος.) In *Itaque*, we have the union of ITA and *Que*. The Etymologists justly compare the Latin ITA with the Greek EITA, (Ειτα, Postea, Deinde,) Upon IT or *That;* to which we must add EITHA=^*R*, *Ep*=EITA, (Ειθαρ, statim, confestim, Επειτα, Deinde, Postea.) We cannot but note the Demonstrative *Ea* in the explanatory word 'Post-*Ea;*' and *De=Inde*, we know, signifies 'From *That*—place—person—time,' &c. In the phrase "To *Ep*="EITA," (To Επειτα, Posteritas,) we see a combination with a kindred term. The EP belongs directly to the Greek *Epi*, *Epei*, (Επι, Ad, Επει, Postquam,) which we must refer to the Element ^P, &c. bearing the same sense. In the Latin AP=UD, *At*, we see a combination of a similar kind from AB and UD or ID. Among the senses of *Ab*, R. Ainsworth justly gives us, 'After, next,—AT—'In,' &c. The Latin AT will remind us of the AUT in *Autem*, or AUT=*Tem;* and the *Tem* is the same as the *Dam* or *Dem* in 'QUI=*Dam*, *Idem* or Id=*Dem;*' and the *Tem* in *Item* or

'It=*Tem.*' Thus, then, *Autem* and *Item* are only different forms of *Idem.*

The Greek Eis, (Εις, In, Ad,) has a similar meaning to Ad; and we shall now understand, that it has the same radical meaning as a word under the same form, Eis, (Εις, Unus,) One, *This* or *That* Person, though applied to a different purpose. Let us mark the Latin *In*, and remember its parallels, the English *In*, and the Greek *En*, (Εν,) which have the same relation to *En*, ('Εν, Unum,) *Unus*, and *One.*—If the Reader should doubt about the original sense, which I have supposed to be annexed to Ad and At, of *This*, *That;* I shall produce a Greek word, which is acknowledged to signify, as an Adverb and Conjunction, "In *This* or "*That* Manner," and to be often used precisely as the English *That* is; while the same word is likewise employed as a Preposition, corresponding with Ad. The Greek Oos, (Ως, Ut, Sicut, Perinde ac si, &c.—Pro προς, *Ad*, In, Ως, Ita, *Sic*, pro Ουτως,) signifies *Thus*—in *This* or *That* Manner—*As*,—*That*, (Εγω ουν εγινωσκον, ως ουκ εδει, &c. ubi Ως ponitur pro Οτι); and it likewise means *To.* It would be idle to produce instances of senses, which every schoolboy acknowledges. Another form of Oos is Eoos, (Ως, Εως.) It is curious to mark the particles, with which Oos, (Ως,) is joined, and which have all, as I imagine, the same original meaning; as Oos}*Ei=The Ge*, *Per*, *An*, *Ara*, *An Dee=^La=Dee*, *An Dee=Pou*, *Dee=Pou=The=^N*, *Ge*, *Oun*, *Oun Dee*, *Te*, &c. &c. (Ως, ως ειθε γε, ωσπερ, ως αν, ως αρα, ως αν δηλαδη, ως αν δηπου, ως αν δηπουθεν, ως γε, ως ουν, ως ουν δη, ωστε.) The Etymologists acknowledge, that Oos, (Ως,) belongs to Os, (Ος,) and Autos, Ον τροπον, Quemadmodum,—Αυτον τροπον, ωσαυτως, where we again see the Oos, (Ως,) joined with the word Autoos, (Αυτως, Sic.) I suspect, that *Pros*, (Προς,) or *Pro=^S*, is a compound of *Pro*, (Προ, ante,) and Eis, Oos, (Εις, Ως,) or some word belonging to our Element ^S, bearing a similar meaning; so that Pro=^S will signify '*Thus* 'Forward—Forward to *This* or *That* Point.'

Let

Let us note the term *Ei*, (Ει, Si, An, Utrum, Utinam, Quod,) which I conceive to be quasi EJ, and of the same radical meaning with Oos, (Ως,) &c. The sense annexed to *Ei*, or EJ, as denoting *If*, may be conceived to be, 'Were things in *This* or '*That* manner'—'Were things *So*,'—('*So* he would but hear;') and hence we join *If* with *That*, and *So*—'*If That*—*If So* be,' as I have before shewn. In the sense of *Utinam* and *Quod*, which EI or EJ bears, it directly signifies *That*—'O *That* such things were!' THE, (Θε,) added to *Ei*, (Ει,) conveys the same meaning as THE in English does. Our Etymologists acknowledge, that UT belongs to ID, Oos, Os, (Ως, Ος); and they remind us, moreover, of *Oti*, (Οτι,) That, and *Ote*, (Οτε, Quando,) which signifies 'At '*That* time, *That*.'—I might here suggest, that Eoos, (Εως, Aurora; —Oriens,) denoting the EAST, under the same form as the Conjunction, may possibly bear the same meaning of '*That*—the 'Distinguished quarter of the Heavens.' But on this point there are many difficulties. The WEST is a kindred word. The terms corresponding with the Latin AD, and the English AT, in the Celtic Dialects, are AD, AT, (Welsh,) AIG, AG, (Gal. and Irish,) which are used in the formation of Participles, as I shew more fully in another place. General Vallancey, in his Irish Grammar, explains AG by "AT, with, by, in possession of;" and the next term to it is AGA, "Whose, Whereof;" where we see it in its original state of a Pronominal part of Speech. In the same column we have AG=*So, Here*; where again AG is applied in its just sense, and AD, "*A*, or *An*." The Latin Etymologists have referred AD to the Hebrew עד OD, "*Ad, Usque Ad*," says Martinius. Mr. Parkhurst explains this Hebrew word by "YET, "*still*.—*Besides, moreover*.—*Again*, YET, *again*.—*More, Until. To*, "*Unto*.—Repeated, *Both—And*," which I shall consider more particularly in another place.

The Greek ETI, (Ετι, Adhuc, Etiamnum,) and the English YET,

YET, contain the same idea of IT, ID, or 'This or That thing.' Let us mark the explanatory terms AD=HUC, 'To *This* or *That*,' ETiam, 'In *This* manner,' which are acknowledged to contain the same idea. While I examine the Greek ETI, (Ετι,) in my Greek Vocabulary, I cast my eyes on ET-*es*, (Ετης, Socius,) ET-*Air-os*, (Εταιρος, Amicus,) ET-*Er-os*, (Ετερος, Alter,) where the ET has the same meaning of '*This* or *That*—Person, a certain Person.' The Etymologists under YET refer us to the Saxon *Get*, *Geta*, the German *Jetzt*, the Welsh *Etwa*, *Etto*, and the Greek *Eti* and *Authis*, (Ετι, Αυθις.) The form of the Saxon *Get*, which may be quasi *Ge*=IT, might lead us to think, that Y=ET was a compound. The Greek *Authi*, (Αυθι, Illic, Ibi ;—Huc,) and *Auto=Thi*, (Αυτοθι,) 'In *This* or *That* place,' is acknowledged to be derived from AUT-*os*, (Αυτος, Ipse,) 'He, *This* or *That* Person ;' yet *Authis*, (Αυθις, Denuo, Rursus, Iterum ; Posthac, in Posterum,) which is nothing but *That* or *This*, succeeding or added to a former action, 'Post-*Hac*,' the Lexicographers derive from *Au*, (Au.) It is justly joined with a cognate word, the Article, to express the same thing, as 'O, Ee, 'To *Authis*, The Succeeding one,' (O, η, το Αυθις, Sequens, Posterus.) This is a similar combination, with a similar meaning, to '*O*, *Ee*, *To* 'AUT-*os*,' (O, η, το Αυτος, Idem,) *The This*—*The That*—or 'The Same 'again, as before,' or, as we might express it in English by congenial terms, '*The As*, *The Such*.' We see now, that *Autothi*, and *Authis*, (Αυτοθι, Illic, Αυθις, Rursus,) means 'In *That* or *Such* a Place,' and 'In *That* or *Such* a Manner ;' which latter phrase of itself, without the addition of *As before*, or *Again*, would denote the repetition of the action before done, as a similar combination does the identity of the Person, who was before mentioned. *Idem*, we know, too, is from Is—'*This* or *That* person.' We find, however, that AU, (Au, Rursum,) in a similar sense to *Authis*, (Αυθις, Rursus,) exists by itself; which must lead us to refer the one to the other; and yet we at the same time see the relation

relation of *Authis*, (Αυθις,) to *Autos*, (Αυτος, Ipse.) This difficulty can only be solved by supposing, what I have often thought, that *Autos* was itself a compound of *Au*, or Av, Af, *Ap*, denoting Being, *He*, &c, corresponding with Ef, (Welsh,) &c. &c., and ^T or T^, bearing the same meaning. Perhaps the Aut or Apt is the same combination as Ips, in Ips-*e*. In Autika, (Αυτικα, Mox, Statim, Protinus, *Illico*,) we have the explanatory term *Illico*, which belongs, we know, to *Ille*,—*This* or *That* Person, and which will shew us, how such ideas may be connected with the notion of *This* or *That*.

While I am examining Eis, (Εις, In, Ad,) I cast my eyes on Ek, or Eks, (Εκ, Εξ, A, Ab, De, Per, Propter, Juxta, &c. &c.) which, with its parallel term Ex, appears to have the same Radical meaning with Eis, (Εις, In, Ad,) *This* or *That*—Place, Person, &c. by way of distinction; and the different turns of meaning, belonging to these words, as *To*—*From*, are merely the effects of Accident. The Lexicographers explain both of them, in some of their senses by the same words, as *Per*, *Propter*, *In*, *Post*. There is, however, considerable difficulty on this point; and I have given a different idea, respecting these particles, *Ex*, &c. on another occasion. The English Out seems to belong to the Latin *Ex;* and, if this should be the case, we must derive from the same origin the parallel terms to *Out*, as *Ut*, *Utan*, (Sax.) *Uyt*, (Belg.) *Aus*, *Aussen*, (Germ.) *Ut*, *Uta*, *Us*, (Goth.) *Ud*, (Dan.) &c. &c. The English Ut in *Ut*-most, and *Utter*, with its parallel terms *Itter*, (Swed.) *Ytre*, (Isl.) *Utter*, (Sax.) belong to *Out*—*Outer*. This seems to bring us to *Other*. To Utter is To Bring *Out*. The terms *Issue*, *Issir*, (Fr.) *Uscire*, (Ital.) belong to Ex. I have suggested, on a former occasion, that Ex and Out might possibly belong to our Element, under the idea of the *Base*, as the Spot *From* or Out of which things may arise; and I shall exhibit a race of words, in a future page, which signify,

signify, To *Stir* up or Out the *Earth*, Est*ia*, (Εστια); and from this idea may Ex, Out, &c. be derived. When various notions concur, which might on the first view of the question with equal probability supply the origin of the word; and when we have no evidence, from which we could decide on the original sense annexed to it, our judgment must be suspended, till such evidence can be obtained. I shall here, however, produce whatever arguments present themselves, which may seem to shew, how such terms might naturally be referred to the race of words now before us.

Outrage is in ancient French *Oultrage*, which is referred to *Outre*, *Oultre*, and which they derive from *Ultra*. Now *Ultra* has precisely the same meaning as Ex=*tra*, and the *Ul* certainly belongs to *Ullus*, *Alius*, &c. This will serve to illustrate my Hypothesis, that Ex belongs to Hic, Is, &c. While I am examining my Saxon and Gothic Dictionary, I cast my eyes on the Gothic Uth*than*, Autem; where we see a Conjunction, derived from the idea of *This—That*, as Aut*em* is. In the same column of Lye's Dictionary, I perceive "Uth=*Wita*, *Wite*, *Wuta*, Sapiens, Sophista, "Philosophus;" where the Uth appears to be used in its intensive sense, and *Wite* is *Wise*. Adjacent to Out in Skinner is Ought, which must surely be considered, as a Demonstrative part of Speech,—'*This* or *That* thing—Any thing—It,' &c. The parallel terms to *Ought* are *Owiht*, *Awiht*, *Aht*, *Uht*, (Sax.) &c. &c. Skinner says, that *Awiht* is the same as *Wiht*, "Quodvis "Animal." Lye explains Wiht by "*Wight*. Creatura, animal, "res.—Res quævis; aliquid, quidvis, quidquam." *Wight* must probably be added to these words; and if so, the term *Whit*,—"Not a *Whit*," belongs to the same race. From *Ought* is derived *N^=Ought*, *N=Aught*, as *Nequis* is derived from *Ne* and *Quis*. There is no part of the office attached to the Etymologist so difficult, as that, in which he endeavours to discover the origin of certain

certain terms, when different senses belonging to his Radical may alike be applied to them. I have examined, on a former occasion, (page 121,) various terms, which denote *Property* and *Possession;* and I have supposed, that they may be derived from the EARTH, as the great source from which Property and Possession are acquired. Nothing can be more obvious and natural than this origin. Yet we may observe, that the idea of *Property*, or of that, "quod cuique *Proprium* est," might be derived from the notion of '*This* or *That* Peculiar Person,' as distinguished from another; and thus OUGHT, *Own*, in Gothic, AIG*in*, &c. HEAD, or HOOD, &c. (as Maiden-*Head*, Knight=*Hood*,) might belong to the race of words now before us. Among those terms, I have produced *Again* and *Against*, which may possibly be likewise attached to the train of ideas, which I am here unfolding. The AG=AIN might be a compound of the Elements ^G=^N, denoting Being, of a similar kind to *Idem*, or *Id=Dem*, *O Autos*, (Ο αυτος,) &c., and might mean '*This—That*, as before, or re-'peated—The *Same;*' and the idea of AG=AINST directly connects itself with *This* and *That;* as '*This*, corresponding with—distin-'guished from, or as opposed to *That.*' I shall shew, that the Greek *Anti*, and *Ant=ios*, (Αντι, Αντιος,) belong to the Element ^N, denoting Being, to EN, (Εν,) *One*, *An*, (Eng.) &c. &c. Yet these words *Again*, *Against*, &c. present to us considerable difficulties, which it is not easy to unravel.

In Saxon, OTH signifies "Donec, Usque, Dum," which coincides with the sense of AD, &c. EIS, (Εις,) &c. Lye explains "OTH *Hider*," HUC Us*que*, where in HUC, US, we see *This—That.* The US is only HIC—HUC, &c. as I have before observed. Let us mark the Saxon *Hider*, belonging to the English *Hither*, which I have shewn to be the same combination as *Other;* and I have likewise shewn, that *T^Hither* belongs to *Hither*, as *Th^-Ateron* does to *Eteron*, (Θαταρον, Ετερον.) I have suggested,

suggested, that AD, EIS, (Εις, *Ad,*) and EK, EKS, (Εκ, Εξ, Ε,) EX, may have the same radical meaning of *This* or *That*, as the Distinguished — Marked Spot, to which things are referred, whether as *That* Spot, To which they tend, or as *That*, from which they proceed. Now the Saxon OTH, Usque, is sometimes used in composition for AD, as OTH-*Clipian*, Adhærere; and sometimes for EX, as OTH-*Brædan*, which Lye explains by *Eripere*, OTH-*hæbban*, EX-Tollere, and OTH-*Byrstan*, Erumpere; where we see, that OTH coincides with OUT, To *Burst*-OUT, To Stick—Break,—Burst, &c.—to *That* or *Such* a point, if I may so express it, so as to unite, proceed forward, &c. &c.

In the same column of my Greek Vocabulary, where the preposition EK, (Εκ,) is, I find EK=*Ast=os*, (Εκαστος, Singuli, Quisque;) and in an adjoining one, EK=*Ein=os*, (Εκεινος, Ille.) We cannot doubt, but that EK in these Pronouns signifies *That;* and the same form of the Preposition might be some inducement for us to imagine, that the Preposition contained originally a similar idea. The AST in the former Pronoun is an addition of the Element ^C, ^K, ^S, &c. to itself; and the EIN belongs to the Element ^N, bearing a similar meaning. I find, likewise, in the same column with *Ek=Ast=*os, (Εκαστος,) EK=As, (Εκας, Procul,) which is a similar compound, applied to a different purpose, '*That—That* Distance,' by way of exaggeration. We have various compounds of the same words, belonging to different forms of our Element ^C, ^S, &c. C^, &c., which are all employed for the same purpose of increasing the signification, *Ek=Ast=Atoo*, *Ek=Asta=Chee*, *Ek=Asta=Cho=Thi*, *Ek=Asta=Cho=Se*, *Ek=Asta=Cho=The=^N*, &c. (Εκαστατω, Longissime, Εκασταχη, Ubique, Εκασταχοθι, Ubique gentium, Εκασταχοσε, Quocumque, Εκασταχοθεν, Undique,) which mean *This There—That There* Spot—Way off, &c. &c. In EK=AT=*Er-os*, (Εκατερος, Alteruter,) we have a combination of EK and ET=*Er-os*, (Ετερος,) which is compounded of our Element

Element ^T and ^R. In EK=OON, (Εκων, Voluntarius, qui sponte aliquid facit,) we have a similar compound to that of EK=EIN in EK=EIN-*os*, (Εκεινος,) as it means *Is Ipse*, *Is* qui ex se *Ipso* aliquid facit. In AUTH=EK=AST-*os*, (Αυθεκαστος, Severus, rigidus;—Justus,) we see a compound from AUT-*os* and EK=AST=*os*, (Αυτος, Εκαστος); and the term denotes 'A Person, who acts from *Himself*, or 'from his *Own* feelings, without regard to the condition of others,—'The *Selfish* Personage,' as we express it. The word literally means 'The *Each-Himself* man,' if I may so say;—the man, who acts as if *Each* individual was acting only for *Himself*. The various compounds of AUT-*os*, (Αυτος,) will shew us the different uses to which the Demonstrative Pronoun may be applied, as AUTH=*Ades*, (Αυθαδης, Sibi placens, se ipsum admirans,) AUTH=*Airetos*, (Αυθαιρετος, Voluntarius, Ultroneus); where we have the same sense, as in *Ek=Oon*, (Εκων,) AUTH=ENT-*es*, AUTH=ENT*eo*, (Αυθεντης, Qui suâ manu se perimit;—Auctor cædis; Auctor quilibet;—Dominus, Auctor, Αυθεντεω, Auctoritatem in aliquem usurpo, Dominor,) from which, as we know, the term *Authentic* is taken. The ENT in this word is not derived from Ιεσθαι, Mittere, Αυτος Εις, Εντος, qui se ipsum mittit ad negotia; or from Ενω, occido; but it belongs to the Element ^N, bearing the same meaning as AUT. On a former occasion, (p. 257.) I have referred AUCT*or* and its parallel terms to the idea of the Base, which is probably right. Yet we ought to observe, that AUT=*os*, (Αυτος,) has here precisely the same meaning as AUCT*or;* and thus the original idea of this latter word might possibly be the same as that of the former. This word AUCTOR seems to be directly attached to AUGEO, which must likewise be referred to the *Base*, if my conjecture is right respecting the source of *Auctor*. The Latin AUG*eo*, however, appears to belong to some Saxon and Gothic terms, which may be thought not to be derived from the Base. All this will be examined on a future occasion.

We shall now understand, that Ac, Et, and At, whether as simple or compounded, in At-*Que*, all belong to each other, and denote Hoc—Id, &c., 'In *This* or *That* manner, Likewise, *So*, 'Also.' Robert Ainsworth explains Ac in one sense by As, where we have both the Demonstrative and the Relative idea; "Est "animus erga te *Idem*, Ac• fuit;" where the Demonstrative Pronoun Is, in *Idem*, has the same relation to Ac, which *That* has to itself in its two uses of the Demonstrative and Relative turn of meaning, "My mind is towards you *That*, *That* it was." The Greek Eede, (Ηδε, apud Poëtas pro Και,) Eedee, (Ηδη, *Jam*,) mean 'In *This* manner—time.' The Etymologists derive Ac from Ago; "Notat enim *Agmen*," says Martinius, "quia est Conjunctio "Copulativa." He sees, however, its relation to At*que;* and he refers it, moreover, to terms connected with our old English word Eke. We should imagine, on the first view, that Eke, and its parallel terms *Auk*, *Eac*, (Goth. and Sax.) *Æc*, (Sax.) Etiam, *Auch*, (Germ.) &c., belong to Ac; yet on this point considerable difficulties occur. Eke, &c. has been justly referred to a race of verbs, signifying To Add, as *Eacan*, (Sax.) *Aukan*, (Goth.) &c.; and if Eke is attached to Ac, the verbs *Eacan*, *Aukan*, (Sax. Goth.) &c. must be derived from *Eke*, &c. Yet the same verbs seem to connect themselves with the Latin *Augeo*, and the Greek *Auxo*, (Αυξω,) which are attached, I imagine, to a very different idea. Martinius reminds us, under Ac, of the Hebrew אך AK, *Utique*, another of these terms; where let us mark, in Uti*que*, the Ut belonging to Id. He observes, moreover, "Alludit ad Græcum "Και, per metathesin." The Greek Kai and Te, (Και, Τε,) under the form K^, &c., have a similar meaning.

We perceive in At=Que and At=Qui, how the Que and Qui are joined with At; and this will shew us the original idea annexed to At, which I conceive to be the same as Id. Aut is another form of At, applied to a different purpose, as in 'Aut

'Cæsar

'Cæsar—AUT Nullus,' which means 'This character—Cæsar, That 'character—Nobody.' It is agreed, that *Or* and its parallels *Oder*, (Germ.) &c. belong to *Other—Either*. R. Ainsworth explains AUT by "Or, or Else, Either.—It is often Disjunctive.—"Sometimes Conjunctive." We all know, that QUE has this double use; and we learn, from my Hypothesis, that the Conjunctive and Disjunctive senses are alike annexed to these words. In the Conjunctive sense, *This* or *That* marks or demonstrates similitude; and in the Disjunctive it marks difference. 'Cæsar 'ET Pompeius pugnarunt, Cæsar fought—In *This* manner—'*So*—Likewise Pompey fought.—Cæsar AUT Pompeius vicit, 'Cæsar conquered, He, such a person—Cæsar conquered—*Either* '—the *Other*,—*That* person—Pompey conquered.' The Greeks, we know, use H, vel, which bears the same relation to H, the Demonstrative article and the Relative, (Ο, η, το, ος, η, ο,) that *Que* bears to *Qui*, denoting 'Any one, Who.' The Greek ΚΑΙ, (Και,) means likewise ET and AUT; and it expresses various other turns of meaning, which we annex to different Adverbs and Conjunctions, &c., as *Sic*, *Nam*, *Sed*, AT, IGITUR, &c. &c. as the ordinary Lexicographers detail to us. In the Vocabulary of Hederic we have thirty different senses annexed to ΚΑΙ, (Και,) and the particles combined with it. In one sense we have "Ponitur et "pro Relativo Pronomine,' where we have the relation of *Que* to *Qui*. The Latin *Autem*, as I have observed, belongs to *Aut*, as *Idem* or *Item* to *Id*. One of the senses of AUTEM produced by R. Ainsworth is "*And Also*," where we unequivocally see the sense of *Item*—In *This* Manner. In the sense of *But* it marks *Difference* and Distinction—*This—That* thing, as compared with another thing, by way of some dissimilitude.

The Lexicographers, though they have explained AT by the general expression *But;* yet they have added the various purposes, to which this particle is applied, of *Distinguishing*—whether by

by Admiring—Dispraising, &c. &c.; and this brings us to the use of the *Distinguishing*—or *Demonstrative* Parts of Speech, *This*—*That*, &c., AT, says R. Ainsworth, "*But.* (1) In *Distinguishing*, "(2) Threatening. (3) Admiring. (4) Dispraising. (5) Ob-"jecting and Answering." The Etymologists understand, that the succeeding word AT-AT, "(1) An Interjection of surprise, "Hoida! how now! (2) Of Admiration; O strange! O wonder-"ful!" &c. &c., belongs to AT; where we fully see the use of the Demonstrative Part of Speech, *That! That!* and we moreover again observe a propensity in the mind to combine terms of this nature. Hence we have the Greek OT-OTOI, (Οτοτοι, Heu! Hei!) ATT-ATAI, ATT-ATAI-AX, (Αττατατ, Αττατατατ.) Let us mark the adjacent words to *Ototoi*, (Οτοτοι,) *Oti*, and *Ote*, (Οτι, Quod, Quia, O, τε, Quando,) which belong to the same idea, *This*—*That*,—*That* time, When; and they are alike to be referred to our Element ^T^ or T^, whether we consider them as simple or compounded. EUTE and EEUTE, (Ευτε, Aliquando, Quando, Hυτε, Sicut, Tanquam,) still mean At *That* time *That*, in *That* Manner. While I am examining *Eeute*, (Hυτε,) I cast my eyes on EEUS, (Hυς, Bonus;—Strenuus,) which might mean *That*—Illustrious Personage, by way of distinction; but on this there are some doubts. The preceding word to *Ototoi*, (Οτοτοι,) in my Greek Vocabulary, is *Otobos*, (Οτοβος, Strepitus,) which may lead us to consider, whether OT in this word be attached to the interjection of Admiration. The *Tob* in *Ot=Tob* belongs probably to the Element TB, denoting Noise. In the same column with *Attatai*, (Αττατατ,) I find *Atuzo*, (Ατυζω, Terreo, Perturbo, Obstupefacio,) which relates to a state, according with the sense of the Interjection; but whether it be significant I cannot decide. There is another adjacent word ATTO, (Αττω, Prosilio, subsilio, subsulto,) which may mean, 'To move from *This* place to *That*—*Here* and *There*.' The example cited by my Lexicographer brings us to this very idea,

idea, Αττων δευρω κακειστε. I produce, however, in another place, words, expressing *Motion*, which are derived from a different train of ideas. I must observe, however, that on the origin of the Interjections, belonging to our Element, considerable difficulties occur.

Let us now mark another adjacent term to ATT-ATAI, (Αττατατ,) the Greek ATTA, the term of respect to the old Man, which may mean the 'Is, *The* Being or Personage—*This* or *That* 'Illustrious Being or Personage,' (Αττα, vox, quâ juniores *Senes* compellant, sodes amabo, Pater, Lat. ATTÆ, Senes.) Whatever we may think about the origin of ATTA, (Αττα,) as denoting '*This*—'*That*, or *The*—*Distinguished* Personage;' we have a word, under the same form, which actually means, as a Pronoun, *This*—*That*, or in the plural *These* and *Those*, as ATTA, (Αττα, pro ατινα, Aliqua, Quædam;—vocula in sermone plane abundans); where we see unequivocally the idea supposed in my Hypothesis. This word ATTA, (Αττα, Quædam,) is not put for Ατινα, but appears under its true form. When it seems to *abound*, or to be *idle*, as it is called, in a sentence; it assumes one of the characteristic offices of these *Demonstrative* Parts of Speech, which are added for the purpose of conveying more strongly what was already expressed, as Πολλα ATTA ματην δια σπουδης εσχεν, "Multa studiose "frustra curavit—Many *such* things;" and Ποια ATTA διεπραξατο; "Which of *These* sort of things did he do?" &c. &c. The term ATTA likewise means a person, "qui *talipedat*, hoc est, propter "vitium crurum, aut pedis, plantis vel talis, insistit." This term is probably derived from the *Hobbling* mode of walking, (as we express it,) which belongs to the ATTA, or Old Man. The Etymologists derive it from Αττω, Salio. While I am examining this term in Vossius, I cast my eyes on *Attubus*, which means a person "qui laborat linguæ vinculo;" and is derived from A and Τυπος, "quia sensa animi expedire nequit verborum *Typis* sive "formis." The *Attubus* might possibly belong to the Old Man, the

the ATTA; "Canus, comosus, hispidus, trux, ATTUBUS," (Auson.) as it is corrected by Scaliger. The AT, in AT=*Avus*, must be referred to this race of words, ATTA, (Ατται,) as the AV in AV*us*, to the Element ^B, ^V, bearing the same meaning,—to اب AB, (Arab.) &c. ASSA in Latin means "A Dry Nurse:—"A Midwife or nurse, that tends lying-in women;" and it is justly referred by some Etymologists to ATTA, (Ατται,) who produce the terms of address, as distinguished from each other, Το δε Παππα πατρος, Τεττα φιλου, το δε Ατται τροφεως, Το δε Ηθεις αδελφου. The parallel terms to ATTA, Father, are to be found through a wide compass of Human Speech; and they have been collected, with some minuteness by many, who have written on the theory of Languages.

I have supposed that these terms, denoting *This* or *That*, are derived from *Place;* and it is extremely difficult to decide, in many cases, whether the *Primary* or the *Secondary* idea has afforded the immediate origin of the term examined. On the first view we might suppose, that AD belonged to the notion of *Place*, as 'Eo AD Londinum,' 'I go *Place* London;' yet, on carefully examining the whole subject, I cannot but conclude, that the *Secondary* idea has generally operated, and that AD may be considered as only another form of ID. We find, through the whole of these discussions, that every thing tends to confirm this Hypothesis. The sense of AD, we see, connects itself with motion, as 'Eo AD Londinum,' '*Itum* AD Londinum,' 'I go, To 'go—to London.' Here some difficulty will arise, as I before suggested, in deciding on the precise idea, from which certain words, belonging to our Element ^C, ^D, &c., denoting *Motion*, are derived. On the first view, we should imagine, that terms, expressing Motion, To *Go*, &c., as IT*um*, &c., were directly taken from the EARTH,—EARTH, the Spot on which that Motion was made. In many cases, under other Elements, we shall find this to be the fact;

fact; and some of the terms belonging to our Element ^C, ^D, &c. were probably directly taken from the EARTH. Let us mark the form of *Adeo*, (the Adverb,) "To *That* pass," and *Adeo*, (the Verb,) 'To Go to;' and we shall be inclined to think, that it was the same word, applied to different parts of Speech. If such should be the fact, then *Eo*, the verb, may be considered as *Eo, That*, (the Demonstrative Pronoun); and thus *Eo*, 'I Go,' originally signified, *Eo*, 'I *That*,' if I may so express it, or 'I pass 'from *This* place to *That*.' According to such an Hypothesis, wherever the ^T occurs, as in IT, IT*um*, it should be considered as belonging to the form of ID. In IB=*am*, IBO, IVI, we have the Element ^B, ^V, &c. belonging to IBI. It is oftentimes very difficult to distinguish between the Radical part and that, which arises from the analogy of the Language: and such is the difficulty, which exists in the terms before us, IT, IB=*am*, IV*i*.

The Greek *Eimi*, (Ειμι, Eo,) is perhaps quasi EJ=*mi;* and I have suggested, in a former page, that perhaps *Eimi*, (Ειμι,) Sum, is likewise quasi EJ=*mi*. But however this may be, we see the true form of the word signifying 'To Go,' in *Eis, Eisi*, (Εις, Εισι,) as we do that of the verb signifying To Be, in *Eis, Esti*, (Εις, Εστι.) We cannot but note the coincidence in form between these words, which express *Being* and *Going;* and they agree likewise with each other in their Radical idea. I suppose, that the verb of Being, ESTI, (Εστι,) means 'He Is—*Placed;*' and the verb denoting *Going*, *Eisi*, (Εισι,) means, as I suppose, in its primary sense, 'He *Places*,' if I may so say, or 'He Goes from *Place* to '*Place*.' The Greek *Iemi*, (Ιημι, Mitto,) appears in its true Radical form in *Ies, Iesi, Iethi*, (Ιης, Ιησι, Ιεθι,) &c.; and the sense of *Sending* is derived from that of *Placing, Putting*, &c. R. Ainsworth justly explains *Mitto* in one sense by "To *Put* in, To *Put*. "In Acta *Mittere*—Sub jugum," &c. In another sense he explains

plains it by "To make to *Pass*, To *Go*;" and thus we see, how, under a different point of view, *Eimi*, (Ειμι, Eo,) To Go, and *Iemi*, (Ιημι, Mitto,) To Send, agree with each other. This verb *Iemi*, (Ιημι,) is supposed to belong to the verb *Eo*, (Εω.) From a word under this form *Eo*, (Εω,) the term *Eimi*, (Ειμι, Sum,) To Be, is likewise supposed to be derived; and it is imagined, moreover, that it signifies *Induo*, which means, To *Put* or *Place* on, and *Colloco*; where we have the very idea proposed in my Hypothesis, (Εω, Εσω,—Εσσει, Induet, Εω, Inusitat; hinc f. Εσω.—Εσας, Collocasti.) We perceive the Radical form of these words in the future Eso. In Esthes, (Εσθης, vestis, ab Εω,) which is supposed to be derived from *Eo*, we have likewise the true form, as in *v*-Est*is*, &c. We cannot but perceive, how these forms connect themselves with Estia, (Εστια,) *v*=Esta, the *Ground*.

Among the terms denoting Motion, *Coming* or *Going*, which belong to our Element, we must class the following: Od=*os*, (Οδος, Via, *Iter*, Οδευω, Iter facio,) Oichomai, (Οιχομαι, Abeo,) Eeko, Iko, Ik*neomai*, Ik*ano*, (Ηκω, Venio, Accedo, Ικω, Venio, Ικνεομαι, Venio, Advenio;—Supplico, obsecro, Ικανω, Convenio, adeo, adsequor, supplico); where in the two latter words the *n* appears to be an organical addition to the K. To the idea of Supplication, as connected with that of Approaching or Going to, which is expressed by these latter words, we should perhaps refer Ik*etes* and Ik*eteuo*, (Ικετης, Supplex, Ικετευω, Supplico.) I have produced an Arabic term on a former occasion, (page 173.) where I have shewn, that the idea of *Petitioning* is sometimes connected with that of *Remaining* in a certain *Spot*—or *Place*. In Saxon, Eode is *Ivit*; and it is supposed by the Grammarians to be the Preterite of *Gan*, To Go. In old English, Yede has a similar meaning. (See Hawkins' Old Plays, I. p. 100. and Dodsley's Collection of Old Plays, II. p. 53.) I cannot determine the precise idea, from which these terms denoting Motion are derived; as we

we have no evidence to decide, whether the primary or secondary notion originally prevailed in them, or whether they are not derived from the idea of *Excitement*, which I fully illustrate on another occasion. I have thought it right, however, to produce them in this place with the preposition AD, that the Reader might be enabled to form his own judgment on the question. In another place, I produce some Hebrew terms for Motion, which appear to be directly connected with the secondary idea.—The Greek EUTH*us*, and ITH*us*, (Ευθυς, Rectus, Ιθυς, Rectus,) seem immediately to belong to the Path, or the *Ground*—the OD-*os*, (Οδος,) &c. The AITHA, in *Up*=AITHA, (Υπαιθα, Coram, Recte,) must be referred to these words. The English word *Go*, with its parallel terms *Gan*, (Sax.) *Gaen*, (Belg.) *Gehen*, and the Greek KIO, (Κιω,) produced by the Etymologists, belong to the form of the Element G^, with the breathing after the Radical. The *n* in some of these words is the form of the Infinitive, from whence the English *Gang* is derived. In the Hindostan Dialects, *Jaouna* means To Go, where the *n* is likewise the Infinitive form, as I have before observed.

PARTICLES BELONGING TO THE ELEMENT C^, D^,

originally denoting *This, That.*

De, Dee, Toi, Thi, The, Th^=En, Si, Se, Ze, Chou, Che. (Gr.)

Que. (Lat.)

De. (Lat.)

S^=Us=Que, De=*Que*, De, Di, Da, &c. (Lat. Fr. Span. Ital. &c.)

Da. (Germ.)

The=^*Re*. (Eng.)

To, Zu, &c. (Eng. Germ. &c.)

Too, Zu. (Eng. Germ.) Intensive. *The.*

Dia. (Gr.) *To.*

Da, Za. (Gr.) Intensive Particles.

Ce, Se, Di, Te, *p*=Te. (Lat.)

Ceu—Ke. (Lat. Hebr.) As.

Si, So. (Lat. and Germ.) *So*, If *So* be, &c. &c. &c.

I have shewn, through the whole of this discussion, that the Greek Particles, belonging to our Element ^C^, ^D^, &c., with the breathing either before or after the Radical Consonant, originally denoted *This* or *That;* and were added, either singly or in composition, to mark more strongly the object represented: and I have shewn, in numerous examples, that peculiar position, in which they were employed with their original idea. When this primitive sense became obscure, as I have before suggested, the Particles still continued to be adopted, and to impart a certain force to the sentence, which those, who were conversant with the Language, were enabled to feel, but not to describe and detail. Hence, by Grammarians, they have been sometimes considered as *Expletives* and *Redundant;* and when the meaning of these Grammatical terms is duly limited and defined, it is not necessary to

to raise any violent objection against their adoption. A minute and laborious enquiry into the precise sense, with which Particles are invested in the different modes of their application, may be considered as an idle discussion; and it should be regarded, in my opinion, as a vain and fruitless attempt to unfold that, which admits not of explanation or detail. An investigation of this nature may perhaps accord with the researches of the Metaphysician, but it is remote from those objects of enquiry, which belong to the Philologist and the Scholar.

I have noted, in the course of my enquiry, various Particles, under the form C^, D^, G^, &c. with the breathing after the Radical Consonant, which were originally, as I imagine, derived from the *Demonstrative* part of Speech, and denoted THE, TO, (To,) &c. &c. I shall now collect a brief list of Particles under this form, and place them under one view, before the eyes of the Reader. In this class we may enumerate QUE, QUIA, CEU, CE, DE, DI, TE, *p*-TE, SE, SI, &c. &c. (Lat.); and in a compound state, QU=*In*, CU=^N, SI=^*N*, DI=^*S*, SU=^*S*, CI=^*S*, CI=*Tra*, &c. (Lat.) KE, GE, CHOU, CHE, DA, DE, DEE, DIA, TE, TOI, THE, THI, SE, ZA, ZE, &c. &c. (Κε, Γε, Χου, Χη, Δα, Δε, Δη, Δια, Τε, Τοι, Θε, Θι, Σε, Ζα, Ζε, &c.); and in a compound state, KE=^*N*, DEE=^*N*, THE=*N*, THEE=^*N*, DEE=THA, DEE=THE=^*N*, DEE=THA=KI, &c. &c. (Κεν, δην, θεν, θην, δηθα, δηθεν, δηθακι,) TO, TOO, DA, ZU, (Eng. Germ.) TO, TE, TO=^T, (Sax. Belg.) THA, THU, (Sax.) Tunc, cum; THEEI, THI, (Goth.) Quia, Ut; SWA, (Sax.) Sic, Ut, So, (Eng.) GE, (Sax.) Et, Item, Cum, Tum, &c.; YEA, with its parallel terms JA, JAH, GEA, &c. &c. (Goth. Swed. Sax. &c.) CÀ, CÌ, JA, DA, DE, SI, &c. (French,) SO^=*Us*, SU^=*S*, (Fr.) &c., QUA, GIU, GIA, SE, SI, SU, SO=^*Tto*, &c. &c. &c. (Ital.) The Reader will turn his eyes to the various terms denoting *This—That*, &c., which I have produced in a former page, (338, &c.) belonging to the same form of the Element C^, D^, &c. Though I have supposed, that the forms

forms ^C^, ^D^, and C^, D^, with and without the breathing before the Radical Consonant, have passed into each other; yet we may consider each form, under one point of view, as constituting a race of words, more particularly belonging to each other. I have supposed, that the notion of Existence, as denoting *This—That* Existing Person, or Thing, *This—That*, is derived from the idea of *Place*, as the term *Existence* itself is; and I have supposed, moreover, that this idea of *Place* is attached to words, under the same Element, denoting The *Ground*, &c. Under the form C^, D^, &c. we have terms, signifying the *Ground*, as GEA, GE, (Γεα, Γη, Terra,) CE, (Irish,) DE, DEO, (Δη pro γη in Δημητηρ, Δημητρα, Δηω, Ceres.) To this form belong the terms Go, with its parallels, as we have before seen, KIO, (Κιω, vado,) &c. GUA, (Γυα, Arvum, Jugerum, Via, Fossa,) &c. &c. The adjacent word to GUA, (Γυα,) the term GUI=*on*, (Γυιον, Membrum, in primis majus, ut pes, manusve,) may belong to the idea of the Dirt of the *Ground*, as denoting the *Matter—Substance*. I conceive *Limb* to belong to *Limus*, for the same reason.

DE, (Δε, Vero, Autem, &c.) is used in its original idea, when it is applied to Pronominal parts of Speech, as *O*=DE, (Οδε,) *Toios*=DE, *Tosos*=DE, (Τοιοσδε, Τοσοσδε.) We see, likewise, the original sense of DE, and some of the other Particles, when they are applied to Place, as denoting *This*—or *That* Place—*Here, There*. We learn, moreover, that the ideas which we annex to *In, To*, or *From*, may be only accidental appendages, and may exist in the terms, which express simply *This* or *That, There*, &c.; and we learn from hence, likewise, how terms, denoting *In, To*, &c. may be derived from words, which simply expressed *This*—or *That*. The Particles applied to Place are THI, SI,—In loco *Ouráno*-THI, *Athene*-SI, (Ουρανοθι, Αθηνησι,) CHOU, CHE, *Panta*-}CHOU, CHEE, (Πανταχου, Πανταχη, Ubique, Ubivis); where let us mark, how QUE is used for the same purpose, in *Ubi*-QUE, DE, SE, and ZEE, Ad locum, *Oika*-DE,

Oika-DE, *On*-DE *Domon*-DE, *Ourano*-SE, *Athena*-ZE, (Οικαδε, Domum, Ονδε δομονδε, Ουρανοσε, Αθηναζε,) THE and THE=*N*, DE LOCO, as *Euboie*-THE, *Oiko*-THE=^*N*, (Ευβοιηθε, Οικοθεν, Domo.) The term THE is again used in its original sense, when it is applied to Particles of wishing, as *Ai*-THE, or *Ei*-THE, (Αιθε, Ειθε,) which mean, '*That* a thing were so and so!'—In Latin, as we have seen, the Particles CE, TE, *p*=TE, SE, &c. have the same meaning; as *Hic*=CE, *Tu*=TE, *Suo*=*p*=TE, SE=*paro*, To Place *Here* and *There*, in *This* and *That* Place—Se=SE, &c.; where in SE we have at once the same form for the Pronoun and the Particle. I have shewn, that the Latin SI, If, means precisely the same, as the English So does, SI *Vis*, So—If So be—you are willing. *Seu* may be quasi *Sev* and *Si*=*Ve*, as it is imagined, or it may be in its simple state, as in CEU. In SI=*Ve* we have a compound of *Si* and *Ve;* where *Ve*, under the Element V^, has the same meaning of *This* or *That*, as in the Italian *Vi*. If we imagine the Latin *Ceu* to be a compound of a similar kind from CE and ^V; still the CE in this particle has the same sense as the CE in *Hic*=CE. The Etymologists have justly compared CEU with the Hebrew כ KE, bearing the same meaning.

The English preposition IF, with its parallel Provincial and Saxon term *Gif*, has been derived by Skinner from the Saxon verb *Gif*an, To Give. Though this origin appears on the first view probable, yet I do not conceive, that the conjecture is well founded; as it supposes a species of formation, foreign from the genius of Languages in the production of such words. Junius has exhibited, among the parallel terms to IF, the Gothic *Gabai*, and the Teutonic forms *Jof*, *Ob*, *Oba*, *Ibu*. We here see, that in some of these terms the word appears, as in English, without the *G*, and this I imagine to have been an original form. Dr. Jamieson, under the Scotch "*Gif*, *Gyve*, *Geue*, *Gewe*," denoting IF, has justly expressed his doubts on the origin which Skinner has

has proposed to us. He properly observes, that "*Iba*, *Iof*, *Ob*, "*Oba*, occur in Alem. and *If*, in Isl. in the sense of *Si*. A. S. *Gu* "also signifies *If*, which can have no connexion with the v. *Gif-an*, "but seems immediately formed from Moes. G. *Gau*." We here see, that the term for IF appears likewise under the forms GU, GAU, which belong to the Saxon and Gothic *Ge* and *Ga*, used in composition, &c. Lye explains GE thus: "In compositione idem "quandoque valet quod *Cum*, Latinis; alias, sæpius scilicet, "otiosum est. Præfixum hoc postea mutatum est in *Y*; ut GE- "*Writen* in *Y*=*Written*: GE-*Clypod* in Y-Cleped:" &c.

The GE simply means *The*, *This*, &c., as "THE thing "written," &c. The sense of GE, as denoting THE—*This*—*That*, &c., will be manifest from Lye's interpretation of GE in another Article; "*Et*, *Item*—GE—GE, Cum—Tum, ut GE *lare*, GE *bysne*, "Cum doctrina, tum exemplo," '*As* by Learning, So by exam-'ple, In *That* manner by Learning, or *As* by Learning, In *That* 'manner, or So by example; — Doctrina=QUE, Exemplo=QUE;' where QUE, belonging to QUI, *That*, has a similar meaning. Under GE we have the following combinations: GE *Eac*, Sed Et, GE *Swa*, Ut Et; where it is joined with So, a term of the same kind, and GE *Deah*, Etiam, Quamvis, Immo licet. I have shewn in another place, that *Ut*, *Et*, belong to *Id*; and thus GE and SWA or So are combined with each other, under the same meaning, just as *Ut* and *Et* are. The next article in Lye is "GEA, YEA, *Ita*, "Etiam, sane," the particle of Affirmation, which means So in *This* manner; and here the explanatory word *Ita* is acknowledged to belong to *Id*. I see, likewise, an adjacent term GE, Ye, Vos; where we actually find a Pronominal part of Speech, under the idea, as I imagine, of *This*—*That*—*Such* a Being. I find, likewise, *Geac*, Item, Quinetiam, which is a compound of GE=*Ac*. We shall now understand, that the Greek Γε, (Γε, aliis vocibus fere adnecti solita, certe; cum pronominibus Quidem.—Και γε

idem

idem quod γε,) directly connects itself with the Saxon and Gothic GE, GA, &c. &c. In KAI GE, we have a combination of similar terms. My German Lexicographer explains OB by "Whether. "OB es wahr ist, oder nicht, Whether it be true or not.—Eben, "als *Ob*, Even as *If;*" where we see, that *Ob* and *If* precisely correspond with each other. Let us mark the terms *Eben* and *Even*, where *Eb* and *Ev* belong likewise to the Element ^B, and convey the same Radical idea as *Ob*, IF, or mean '*So*, In *This* Manner.' In the phrases *Eben* So wohl, (Germ.) "*Even* So well," *Efen* SWA, (Sax.) "*Even* So, Even As," we see the *Eb*, *Ev*, *Ef*, in *Eben*, *Even*, *Efen*, used in their genuine sense of *So*—in *This* or *Such* a manner. In old English, EVEN is used for a *Fellow*, or *Such a person as*—*Talis Qualis*, *Is Qui*, *Idem*, &c. The Grave-digger says in Hamlet, "And the more pity that great folks should have coun- "tenance in this world to drown or hang themselves, more than "their EVEN Christians;" on which the Commentators have justly observed, that the expression means *Fellow* Christians.

We shall now understand, that GU, GAU, and IF, OB, IBA, &c., belong to separate Elements, conveying a similar idea; and that G^=IF, G^=ABAI, are the compounds of GU=IF, GU=IBA, &c. This conjecture is of itself probable; yet we shall have, I think, little cause to doubt on the subject, when we learn, that IBA and IBAI mean in Gothic, *Num*. Lye interprets, likewise, the Gothic JAU by 'Num,' and JA by '*Yea*, Sic.' The JAU and JA are only different forms of GE, GA, &c. I have used the letter J in this case, for no other reason but to shew, that in these Gothic words an initial letter has been adopted, different in form, though similar in power, to that which is used in representing GA. Dr. Jamieson has with equal justice adopted the letter G, in expressing the same word JAU. The Gothic letter, for which I have used G, is similar in form to the Greek Γ, and that, for which I have used J, has supplied the

the form of our English G. In the same column of Lye's Dictionary, where JA is, we have the Gothic *Jabai*, or, as it is commonly represented, *Gabai;* which I consider to be JA=IBAI, or JAU=IBAI. In the same column we have, likewise, JAH, Et, JAI, YEA, Immo, and other Gothic words, which I conceive to be compounds of JA, JAH, &c.; as JAH=*Tha*, Forsan, JA=*Inar*, *Ibi*, JA=*Ind*, Illuc, JA=*Ins*, Ille. In the next column we have JA=*Inthro*, Inde, *Jathau*, Utique, which Lye conceives to be a compound, and which, as he thinks, should be written GA *Thah*, Sive, or JAH *Thau*, as it is in the Codex Argenteus. In this same column, where *Iba* and *Ibai* are, we have likewise the Gothic *Ibn*, *Even*. The *Iba* is compounded with another term in *Niba*, or *N=Iba*, *Ni=Si*, as the same *Ni* is with *Si*. Let us mark the explanatory Latin term *Ibi*, in *That* place, which has the same Radical meaning, as *Iba*, in *This* or *That* manner, *So*. Among the Gothic conjunctions in Manning's Grammar, we have *Thau*, *Gathau*, or GA=*Thau*, which he explains by 'Forsitan.' The Saxon GE is often compounded in the formation of particles, as GESE, quasi GE=*Ese*, YES, *Get*, *Geta*, *Yet*, which I conceive to be *Ge*=^*T*, GE=^*Ta*. The Etymologists understand, that *Ye*=^*S*, *Ge*=^*Se*, belong to *Yea*, the Gothic *Ga*, *Gai*, &c., the Saxon *Gea*, &c. &c. Again, we have *Hwær*, Ubi, or *Where*, and GE=*Hwær*, Ubique, *Hwanon*, Unde, GE=*Hwanon*, Undique, &c. &c. Among the Gothic Conjunctions, collected in Manning's Grammar, we have "*Iba*, *Ibai*, "Num, Numquid," and "*Gabai*, *Gau;* Si." The composition, with the prefix GE, is of great extent; and many words, which appear to have a Radical form, are compounds, derived from this source. Hence we have *Y=On*, *Y=Onder*, *Ge-Ond*, (Sax.) *Y=Ore*, *Y=Ear*, *G=Ear*, which mean *Ge=Ere*, (*Ære*, Sax. &c.) former, or Past time, with various other terms, which will more properly fall under consideration, when the words, with which GE has been thus compounded, shall be examined.

We

We have seen certain Greek Particles, annexed to words, which convey the idea of *In—From—To*, &c.; and which I suppose originally to have signified *This* or *That*. I have shewn, on a former occasion, the truth of my hypothesis, by producing terms, in which this union of ideas actually exists. We shall not wonder, that the sense expressed by these Prepositions is involved in that of the Demonstrative part of Speech, when we recollect, that such a sense is often included in the Noun to which it relates, as *Domum*, *Domo*, '*To* and *From* Home.' The Latin DE, and the English To, signified originally, as I imagine, the same as THE; and when, by the nature of the proposition, as 'I come THE Church, I go THE Church,' we include in the Demonstrative part of Speech those relations of Place, expressed by To and *From*, or, as in Latin, DE, we shall not wonder, that such Demonstrative terms passed into words, denoting such relations.

It is curious to observe, how words still continue to retain their original notion; and we shall marvel to note that acuteness of the mind in perceiving the union of certain ideas, by which it again reverts to the primitive meaning by a secondary and reflex process, somewhat different from the former. Thus the Preposition DE, which I suppose to have been originally a Pronominal or Articular part of Speech, actually possesses in that state a Pronominal or Articular sense, as in Latin, or it may be said to pass into a Pronoun or Article, as in French, &c. Thus our Pronoun *Some*, as used in such expressions as "Would you like *Some* of the "Wing, or *Some* of the Leg, of the fowl," might be expressed in Latin by "Utrum mavis DE ala, an DE poplitibus;" and we all know, that *Some* in French and Italian is expressed by DE, with or without another articular part of Speech. "*Some*," says my French Lexicographer, "either expressed or understood, answers to the "French words DU, DE *l'*, DE *la*, DE *l'*, DES, and DE, as Bread, or

" *Some* Bread, Du *Pain*, *Some* Gold, De *l'or*, *Some* Meat, De *la* " *viande*, *Some* Water, De *l'eau*, *Some* Pears, Des *Poirs*,—Good " Wine, De bonne vin." In many cases, so much is the De conceived to have passed from the office of a Preposition to the office of a Pronoun, that a Preposition is even placed before it, as " J' ai affaires *a* Des gens fort honnêtes." The Grammarians tell us, moreover, "that in many cases either of these two parti- " cles, Du or *Un*," as Chambaud calls them, " may be used," as " Ceux qui vont sur mer, courent *Un* grand danger," or " De grands dangers;" and by some, De is directly called an Indefinite *Article*. The Italians, we know, use *Del*, *Della*, in the same manner, as Du, De *la*, &c. &c. Though all this is familiar to every one, yet no one has seen the process, by which the Preposition, thus applied, has reverted to its original idea.

The true sense of De appears in the phrase *Sus=Que*, De=*Que*, *This* Place and *That*, De=*Orsum*, &c. &c. I have shewn, that the explanatory word Su=^*S*, together with Si=^*C*, Se=^*C=Us*, are compounds, as likewise Se=*D*, or Se=*T*, Ci=^*S*, Ci=*Tra*, &c. &c. The Etymologists suppose, that *Sed* or *Set* is derived from Se=Et, which comes to the same point. The French So=*Us* and Su=^*S*, and the Italian So=^*Tto*, are similar compounds to Su=^*S*, &c.; and we see the simpler form of these words in the Italian Su. If the French Su=^*R* should be likewise a compound, the process of composition will have extended through a wide sphere indeed, as *Sur* belongs to a great race of words, to be found in every form of Speech. On this point I shall not venture to propose an opinion in the present state of our discussion. In the Italian Giu, Below, and Gia, Already, we have other forms; and to this latter term directly belongs the Ja, in *De*=Ja, of the French. These terms denote merely *This* or *That* Spot. We might imagine, that Goe, in the phrase " Sometime *Agoe*," be-

longed

longed to JA, GIA, if it did not appear to connect itself directly with Go, the verb of motion, which belongs to the form GE, (Γη, Terra,) CE, (Celt.) the Earth, &c.

To the Latin DE are acknowledged to belong the terms in modern Languages, DI, DA, (Ital.) DE, (Span. and French,) &c.; to which we must add the Celtic terms, as Do, (Irish, Gal.) &c. &c. Let us mark, in DE=*Que*, the congenial term *Que* added; and observe, moreover, that DE, in this sense, coincides with the German DA, *There*, and with THE in the English compound THE=^*Re*, quasi THE=*Here*. The Etymologists justly refer the Latin DE to DI and *Dis*, the particles of Separation. The DI, DIS, mean '*This* or *That* place or thing,' in opposition to another place or thing, as 'I DIS*sent*—I think in *This* Manner,—DI=*Vido*, 'I place in *This* place,' as distinguished from another. The DI=^S is a compound. I have suggested, on a former occasion, that Two, and its parallel terms DUO, (Lat. Gr.) ZWEI, (Germ.) &c., have a similar meaning of *This* or *That* person, in opposition or addition to another; and thus we see, how DI and DUO coincide. TWI=^CE is a similar compound to DI=^S. In the Galic Dialect of the Celtic, DA, DIS, mean *Two;* which perhaps more directly bring us to the DI—DIS of the Latins. While I am examining the word DA in Mr. Shaw's Dictionary, I see DAE, "A Man, A "Person," where we have the original idea; and I find, likewise, DA, the preposition *If*.

I suspect, that the names for the numbers from *One* to *Ten* were most of them originally Demonstrative parts of Speech, denoting simply *This* or *That*. The name for *One*, under the Radicals ^N, ^S, as ONE, EN-*os*, (Ενος,) EIS, (Εις,) are acknowledged to belong to this idea. A similar idea is annexed to *Three*, and its parallels *Tres*, *Treis*, (Τρεις,) *Thrie*, (Sax.) *Drei*, (German,) *Tri*, (Welsh, Galic,) &c., which must be referred to the compound Celtic terms produced in a former page, *D^=Ar*,

"By,

"By, Through, Whose, Whereof," *Tar*, "Beyond, Out of," as Mr. Shaw explains them, which in other Dialects of the Celtic appear under the forms *Tre, Tro, Tres;* to which we must refer the Latin *Tra, Tro,* in *In=Tra, In=Tro, Tra=^Ns,* &c. These terms mean simply *This*—or *That*—Place, as in the English *Th^=Ere,* which is precisely the same compound. Thus, *One, Two, Th^=^Ree,* mean the same as AN, or *One,* (Such a person,) THE,(Th^=Is other person,) THE=HERE, or 'That TH=ERE person.' Adjacent to *Dar,* Through, in Mr. Shaw's Dictionary, we have *Dara,* Second, which certainly belongs to *Dar.* The terms for *Three* have a similar idea, under another form. In *Tres, Treis,* (Τρεις,) we have an additional compound, T^=^R=^S; and we find the same form in the Celtic *Tres,* Beyond, and more unequivocally in the Irish *T^=Air=Is,* Beyond. *Tr=Is,* (Lat.) and *Thr=Ice,* (Eng.) are similar compounds. The number *Six* will be considered on another occasion.

We shall surely not doubt, that the English TO is nothing but the Article THE, under another form, "I go THE London," "THE "Rome," 'I go TO London,' 'TO Rome.' The term signifying THE or *This,* and *That,* Place, Thing, or Time, by way of distinction, as the Spot—Action—or Time, to which any thing tends, especially under certain circumstances of the Place or Thing so specified, naturally receives the sense which we express by TO. We shall see the genuine idea of TO more fully, when it is applied to Time; and especially when it is applied to the Present Time. When we say, "I will come TO you TO-Morrow," we perceive, in "TO you," an application of the word, which appears, on the first view, remote from the sense of THE, or *This—That;* but in the phrase "TO-*Morrow,*" we approach nearer to the meaning, and we see, that the substitution of THE for TO would not affect the sense, I will come *To* You—TO or THE Morrow. But when we say, *I will come To You*—TO-*Night,* we see, that the latter TO directly coincides

coincides with the sense of *This*, 'I will come *To* You, TO or '*This* Night.' When TO is applied to the Infinitive Mood, it signifies precisely the same as THE, as 'TO Write—TO *Speak*,' means 'THE action of Writing—Speaking,' &c. It has been frequently remarked, that the use of the Greek TO, (To,) before the Infinitive Mood, TO *Grafein*, TO *Legein*, (To γραφειν, λεγειν,) resembles that of the English TO, at which we shall now not wonder, when we have learnt, that they both signify the same—THE. In Provincial Dialects, Norfolk, &c., TO means THE or *This*, as applied to Time, as 'The apples ripen late TO *Year*,' for *This* Year, or THE present Year. In Saxon, TO is applied to Time in general, as we might use THE, and sometimes *This*, as TO *Niht*, "AD (hanc) vesperam," says Lye—TO *Æfen*, "AD " vesperam," THE Evening, &c.; and in this Language they use " TO Morgen," THE Morning, either for *This* Morning, or TO-*Morrow*, or, as we should say, THE Morrow. Let us mark the use of the Latin AD, which for the same reason coincides with the sense of IS—ID, HIC, &c. as '*Eâ*, *Hâc* vesperâ.' The Etymologists produce the parallel terms for TO, as the Saxon *To*, the Belgic *Te*, *Tot*, *Toe*, and the German *Zu*. The German ZU is applied to *Time* in the same manner, as 'ZU *Nacht*, At Night, THE 'Night.' The Greek DE, (Δε,) as we have seen, is used in a sense corresponding with TO, when it is applied to Place, as *Agoren*=DE, *Klisien*=DE, *Oika*=DE, *Domon*=DE, (Αγορηνδε, Κλισιηνδε, Οικαδε, Δομονδε,) 'TO the Assembly, TO the Tent, TO one's home,' &c. But in the phrase *On*=DE *Domon*=DE, (Αφικετο Ονδε Δομονδε,) we have DE at once used as TO, and connected with a kindred part of Speech, the Pronoun *On*, (Ον,) corresponding with THE, as on other occasions *O* DE, *Toios*=DE, (Ο Δε, Τοιοσδε,) &c.

TO, in the sense which it bears when it is written Too, unequivocally presents to us the original idea of the Intensive Part of Speech, THE—*This*—*That*, by way of eminence or distinction,

distinction, as 'Too Much—Too Little, as THE or *That* (Ex-'cessive) Abundance—Deficiency.' The Saxons and Germans use TO and ZU in the same manner, as TO *Micel*, Nimis Multum, TO *Lytel*, Nimis parvus, ZU *viel*, &c. TO is used in Saxon as a prefix to verbs, either in its sense of *Ad*, or intensively, as TO-*Asendan*, Mittere, TO-*Asettan*, Apponere, TO-*Bædan*, Adprecari, &c., and TO-*Brœcan*, Disrumpere, TO-*Brysan*, Conterere. In Gothic we have, likewise, TO-*Briggan*, Adferre. This use of TO was common in old English, and is to be found in Shakspeare:

"Then let them all encircle him about,
"And, Fairy-like, TO-*Pinch* the unclean Knight."
(*Merry Wives of Windsor*, A. V. S. 4.)

On which Mr. Tyrwhitt has observed, "This use of TO, in com-"position with verbs, is very common in Gower and Chaucer, "but must have been rather antiquated in the time of Shakspeare. "See Gower, *De Confessione Amantis*, B. 4. fol. 7.

"All TO-*tore* is myn araie."

And Chaucer, Reeve's Tale, 1169.

"——Mouth and nose TO-*broke*."

And Mr. Steevens adds, "This use of the preposition TO was "not entirely antiquated in our Author's time. See Spenser, "B. IV. c. 7. B. V. c. 8." And Mr. Malone produces likewise the following passage from Milton:

"Were all TO-*ruffled*, and sometimes impair'd." (*Comus*, v. 380.)

Tickell altered the word *To* to *Too;* and this alteration, though it arose from an ignorance of our ancient Language, is at once, we see, both right and wrong.

I have referred, on a former occasion, the numeral Two to the same idea of THE, *This*, or *That*, in opposition to *One*, conveying a similar notion of *This* or *That*, AN, &c. We know, that Two assumes various forms, as *Tu*, *Twa*, (Sax.) *Zwei*, (Germ.) *Duo*, (Lat.

(Lat. and Gr.) &c. &c. &c. *Twice Twixt*, Be-*Twixt*, *Twain*, *Twin*, are acknowledged to be compounds from Two. I have supposed on a former occasion, that the *Secund* in *Secund-us* belongs to the Saxon *Twægen* or *Tuegen*, which the Etymologists justly produce as the parallel term to *Twain*. The present form of the parallel German word to *Twain* is *Zween;* and if this had appeared under its due original form, we should have had *Zwegen*, or, as it might have been, *t*SWEGEN, which brings us, we see, still nearer to SECUND-*us*, (Lat.) SEGUNDO, (Span.) &c. &c. We have seen, (p. 415.) that SE=OTHER is the Saxon term for the 'Second,' where the SE is the Article. In the term DE=UTER-*os*, we hardly can decide, whether DE belongs to DUO, (Δυο,) Two, or THE; but in TH^=ATER-*os*, (Θατερος,) we have the Articular part of Speech To, (To,) THE; and here again we see, how the ideas of THE and Two pass into each other. In German, the word for *Doubt* is ZWEI*fel*, from ZWEI, *Two;* and this might lead us to conjecture, that DU=^*Bium*, DOU=*Bt*, is derived from DUO. The B^ or BI in this word may belong to the B, and its cognates M, F, in BI=*linguis*, BI=^*S*, BO=*Th*, AMFO, &c. (Αμφω.) The term TWI-*Light* is acknowledged to belong to Two, "TWEO, TWI, "DU*bium*," and *Light*. Hence we have the DI in DI=*Luculum*. The Etymologists suppose, that TWINE belongs to *Twain;* and if so, surely TWIST must belong to the form of TWICE. The English TY is adjacent to *Two*, and, as we should imagine, must be derived from it for the same reason. If that should be so, DEO, (Δεω, Ligo,) must be referred to DUO, (Δυο.) The English *Twenty*, with its parallels *Twentig*, (Sax.) &c., is *Twain* and *Ty* or *Tig*, Ten, DEC-*em*, *Deka*, (Δεκα); and it does not come from the Latin *Viginti*, as the Etymologists imagine. The Latin *Viginti* is quasi *Bis=Denus*, *Zehen*, &c. The Greek term DAIO, (Δαιω, DI=*Vido*,) might belong to DUO, (Lat. and Gr. Δυο,) Two, &c.; but on this point some difficulties occur.

For

For the same reason, that Zu, To, or Too, have an intensive signification, so have the corresponding particles in Greek, Da, Za, (Δα, Ζα,) the same intensive force. In our ordinary Greek Vocabularies, we have "Δα. Particula inseparabilis, augens signi-" ficationem vocum, quibus componitur; v. gr. Δασκιος, ex Δα et " Σκια, Umbra; et Δαφοινος, Cædis admodum avidus, ex Δα et Φονος, " Cædes."—" Ζα. Particula inseparabilis, augens significationem, " ut Ζαπλουτος, Valde dives, Ζαφλεγης, Vehementer ardens. Non " tamen semper." The succeeding word to Za, (Ζα,) is *Zaballein*, (Ζαβαλλειν, εξαπαταν, Decipere, putatur esse à Διαβαλλειν,) which the Lexicographers suppose to be put for *Diaballein*. Whether this be the case, I shall not stop to enquire. Let us note, however, the Greek Dia, (Δια,) which is only another form of the English To and the German Zu, &c. As applied to *Time*, we have Δια δευτερου ετους—Δια τριτου ετους, "Altero Quoque Anno, Tertio Quoque " Anno, *At* the second, third year, At every second, third," Αρχομενος τε και ΔΙΑ τελους τουτο επεμαρτυρατο, " Ab initio usque Ad finem " testatus est, From the beginning TO the End." We here see, that Dia, in Dia *telous*, (Δια τελους,) precisely corresponds with TO; and so the Saxons say, 'TO *his Ende*, Ad ejus finem.' Let us mark, how the Latins express this sense of Dia, (Δια,) by Demonstrative parts of Speech, *Altero—Quoque*. In *Quo=Que* we have the sense of The—The—*This—That;* and let us mark, moreover, the term Ad, which is Id. Among the interpretations of Dia, (Δια,) in our Vocabularies, we have *In, Ob;* and these two Latin prepositions are given in Lye's Dictionary, as the senses of the Saxon TO. Our Lexicographers tell us, that Dia, (Δια,) denotes " Vehementiam aut Excellentiam;" and thus it agrees with the sense of To, or Too, and Zu. It likewise denotes in composition, *Diversitatem*, as Διασκεδαζω, Dispergo, which agrees with the sense of TO in the Saxon TO=*Bræcan*, Disrumpere, TO=*Brysan*, Conterere, and with that of the Latin Di

and

and DI=*S*, as in DI=*Spergere*, and with the sense of Two, *Duo*, &c. &c. &c. Thus DI, DI=^*S*, and DIA, (Δια,) may under one point of view be considered only as different forms of Two, TWI=^CE. The Greek *DU*=^*S*, (Δυς,) belongs perhaps to DI, DI=^*S*, &c. The Lexicographers describe the senses of *Di*, *Di*=^*S*, and DU=^S, (Δυς,) nearly in the same manner. The Greek DUS, (Δυς,) is explained by "Particula inseparabilis notans "in compositione ægre, difficulter; *Male*, Infeliciter. In sive "*Non*, velut α *Privativum*;—*Intensionem*, vel α επιτατικον, valde," &c. R. Ainsworth explains DI and DIS by "Modo *Negationem* "notant, ut D*iffido*, *Non* fido:—Modo diversitatem:—Modo di-"visionem:—Modo *auget* significationem, ut DI*scaveo*, i. e. *Valde* "caveo:—Modo idem est quod *Male*, ut DI*spereo*, i. e. *Male* "pereo." Our Lexicographer has justly expressed the use of these terms; though he has negligently passed from the plural to the singular in his explanation.—On considering the Greek DIA, (Δια,) in its senses of *Diversity*—*Vehemence* or *Excellence*, and as a Preposition *Ad*, we see how it agrees with the different uses of Two, Too, and To.

We have seen in what various manners the *Pronominal* part of Speech, the French QUE, has been used as a Conjunction; and a few observations on some of the Saxon and Gothic Particles, under the form S^, T^, &c. and other forms, which are acknowledged to belong to the *Articular* or *Pronominal* part of Speech, THE, &c., will fully unfold the various purposes, to which *Demonstrative* terms may be applied. I have shewn TH=AT to be a compound, quasi THE=AT; and TH^=AT is used, we know, as a *Demonstrative* and Relative Pronoun, and as a Conjunction. In Gothic, SA, as we have seen, is the Article; and it means "Hic, Qui,"—SA SAEI, "Is Qui." In Saxon, SE is the Article, and means 'Ille, Qui.' The same term SE means likewise EST. SEO in Saxon is used as the Article for all genders; and it denotes

Hic, Qui, &c.; and Seo is moreover used as a verb for *Sum, Es*, Est, &c. The Saxon Tha is the article, used in various cases for The; and it means likewise *Hic, Ille, Iste, Qui*. In a separate place, Lye produces Tha, to which he gives the following senses: "Tum, Tunc,—Quum, Quando,—Quandoquidem.—Dum, Do-" nec.—Tha, Tunc, Quum," &c. The, in Saxon, is the Article corresponding with The, and it means likewise Thee, the Pronoun of the second person. It denotes, moreover, *Is, Iste, Qui*, and likewise "Quod, Quam.—Ut,—An, Sive, Vel, Aut," &c. An adjacent word to this Saxon term is Thea, *Though*, where we have a simpler form of Tho=*Ugh*. We have seen, that in Saxon *Thon* is an article in the Dative and Ablative singular, and it is used, as *Thonne* is, for 'Quam,—Tunc;—Quum, Tum.' To these words belong *Then* and *Than*, which are compounds, quasi The=^*N*, Tha=^*N*, as I have before shewn. Lye interprets *Thonne*, by "Tunc, Tum,—Quando, Quum,—Quomodo.—*Quam;*" and he produces a passage, in which *Thonne* is at once used in various senses. "Tha Welan beoth hliseadigran and leoftælran Thonne " Thonne hie mon selth. Thonne hie beon Thonne hie mon " gadrath and healt.—Divitiæ erunt splendidiores et magis æsti-" mabiles *Tunc Cum*, illas homo diffundit, *Quam* illæ sunt *Cum* ipsas " homo colligit et retinet." The different modes, in which this word is used under the same form, will shew us to what various purposes the same idea may be applied, when it passes into terms, appearing under a variety of forms, in order to mark different turns of meaning, annexed to that original notion. Let us note the explanatory word *Tunc*, which I have shewn to belong to *Thonne*, &c.; and let us note, moreover, *Cum* or *Quum*, and *Quam*, which belong to each other from the same union of ideas, as that which exists in *Thonne*. In Gothic, *Than* is the Article in the Accusative case, and it means likewise "*Cum, Quando, Tum,* " *Tunc. Autem, Vero*," &c. We see, that *Quum, Quam*, have the Accusative

Accusative forms *Quem*, *Quam*, for the same reason. THY in Saxon is used for all cases of the Article and Pronoun, "Usurpatur "pro omnibus casibus Articuli et Pronominis, præcipue vero pro "Ablativo singulari," says Lye; and he explains it likewise by "Quum, Quando;—Tum;—Quandoquidem, Quando, Siquidem;— "Quamvis, Licet.—Ideo.—Quare, Quapropter," &c. &c. I shall not pursue my illustration of this subject to a greater extent; as I have already, I trust, both here and through the whole progress of my discussion, produced abundance of such evidence, which every where presents itself for the support of my Hypothesis.

Under the same form as the Saxon SEO, the Article, we have SEO, Oculi acies, and SEO, the *Sea*. We shall now understand, that SEE and SEA mean *That* or THE remarkable object, and are derived from the Demonstrative part of Speech. The word SEE is used in its original meaning in the Imperative sense. In German, SIEHE is familiarly used with this turn of meaning annexed to the Interjection, "SEE, lo! behold! SIEHE *Da!* look There! "SIEHE *Zu*, take Heed;" where, in its union with *Da*, There, (which directly belongs to the article DIE, *The*,) and ZU, corresponding with the English To, we see the idea from which it is derived, and the terms to which it relates, as I have shewn, that ZU and To belong to THE. The Etymologists produce the parallel terms to SEE in other Languages, as *Seon*, (Sax.) &c., *Sien*, (Belg.) *Sehen*, Videre, *Sie*, *Siehe*, Ecce, (Germ.) as Skinner explains them, *Saihwan*, (Goth.) *See*, (Dan.) and the Greek *Seaomai*, and *Theaomai*, (Σεαομαι, Æol. Θεαομαι, Video.) The parallel terms to SEA produced by the Etymologists are *Sæ*, (Sax.) *See*, (Germ.) *See*, *Zee*, (Belg.) *Soe*, (Dan.) *Sio*, (Swed.) *Saiws*, (Goth.) &c. The Greek SE=*aomai*, and THE=*aomai*, (Σεαομαι, Æol. Θεαομαι, Video,) must be referred to SEE, as we shall all agree; and we observe the true form of these words in THEA, (Θεα, Spectaculum.) In the English SI=^*ght*, and its parallel terms

ge-

ge-Si=*Cht*, we have an addition, arising from the analogy of the Language, in the formation of substantives.

The particle Ec in Latin is nothing but another form of Hic; and it is applied in its due place, when it is added to Pronouns, as Ec=*Quis*. It has a similar meaning in Ec=*Ce*, which is nothing but Hic=Ce—*This*—or *That* remarkable object. Let us note the term Ce, bearing the same sense, and belonging to the form C^, with the breathing after the Radical Consonant, as in See. I do not mean to say, that Ce and See directly belong to each other, but that they convey a similar idea, and are derived ultimately from the same source. It is marvellous to observe, as I have had occasion perpetually to remark, how these Pronouns are combined with each other; and we accordingly see *Ecce*, under its original relations, in the following compounds; *Eccillam*, *Eccistam*, *Eccum*, *Eccos*, for Ec=Ce-{*Illum*, *Istam*, *Eum*, *Eos*. In the compound *Ecastor*, or Ec=*Castor*, the Ec is not derived from *Ædes*, but belongs to Ec the Demonstrative Particle or Adjective, 'Hic Castor!'—"Per *Hunc* vel *Eum* Castorem." We shall now understand, that the Particle En belongs to the Element ^N, bearing the same sense of *This* or *That*—'Mark *That* distinguished object.' The Etymologists refer Ec, when combined with *Quis*, to *Et*, or to the Greek *Eeken*, (Ηκεν Poet. pro Ην,) rather, says Martinius, than from *En*, to which *Ec* in *Ecce* is referred. Under *En*, the Etymologists justly produce the Greek Eeni, (Ηνι,) and the Hebrew הן HN, terms bearing the same meaning, *This* or *That*. Martinius observes under En, after having produced this derivation, "Posset referri ad *Em*, id est, *Eum*, quod et *Im*." He observes under these words, "*Em*, *Im*, id est, *Eum*, ex *Emem*, "q. eum eum Hesych. *ιν αυτον, αυτην*." We shall now understand, that the Latin Hem, the interjection, is significant, and means This! or *That* person! Eum! Eam! The Greek Eeni is sometimes combined with *Ide*, as *Eenide*, (Ηνιδε, Ecce,) which the Lexicographers

graphers suppose to be for *Enide* from *Ene*ido, (Ενιδε ab Ενειδω.) This union of the Demonstrative *Een*, (Ην,) with *Ide*, (Ιδε,) might suggest to us, that IDE has possibly the same sense as Ec, *This* or *That*, See *This* or *That*, and that the Greek verb for *Seeing*, EIDO, (Ειδω, Video,) is derived from this source. I have given a different origin in another place. In the Latin *v*-IDeo, the labial breathing has assumed a Consonant form; and from this form the terms in modern Languages are derived, *Visible*, (Eng. and Fr.) &c. &c. In Persian, we have a combination of the two Elements ^N and ^C, as اینک IN=AK, Behold, which is a compound of این AIN, or ان AN, *This*, *That*, and یک IK or YAK, *One*.

If the Reader should imagine, that in my conjecture respecting the original meaning of EN, as denoting *This* or *That*, I have been influenced by the desire of supporting a favourite Hypothesis; he will be instantly relieved from this suspicion, when he examines the parallel Hebrew word to which the Etymologists have referred us. The Hebrew הנה HNH, is a Pronoun, which means *These* or *Those*, and as a particle, "See, lo, behold—and "*Hither*, *Thither*." Here we have the precise union of ideas supposed in my Hypothesis. Taylor, under הן HN, as the particle of Demonstration, observes, that it signifies likewise "*If*, "*Whether*, *Or*." Mr. Parkhurst produces the same interpretation as the Chaldee sense, ocurring in Daniel and Ezra; and remarks, moreover, that it is perhaps corrupted, like the "Greek Αν, Εαν, "Ην, from the Hebrew אם AM." We shall now understand, that the Greek AN, EAN, EEN, (Αν, Εαν, Ην,) *If*, have precisely the same meaning, and denote In *This*—*That* manner—*Such*, *So*, &c., 'Should the thing be *So* and *So*, I should be glad,'—'*So* you would 'grant me this request, I should be glad;' where we see how the sense of *If* is connected with *This* or *That*. I have shewn, that the Latin SI belongs to the English and German *So*, which my Lexicographer in the first sense explains by *That*, and in another,

by

by "So, *If*, *If* So *be*, *If* So be *That*, &c. &c. Thus, Ο τι ΑΝ λεγοις, πλεον γενησεται μηδε εν, "Quicquid dicas, amplius fiet nihil," may be translated by 'What SO ever you should say, nothing more will 'be effected.' In our translation of the Bible, the Relative Ος, Ο, accompanied by EAN and AN, (Εαν, Αν,) is frequently translated by *Who*, or *What* So *ever*—"*What* So *ever*" (Ο EAN, Ο Εαν,) "thou "shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and *What* So *ever*" (Ο EAN, Ο Εαν,) "thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in "heaven." (Matt. xvi. 19.) And again, in the same chapter, "For "*Who* So *ever*" (*Os*-AN, Ος Αν,) "will save his life shall lose it: "and *Who* So *ever*" (*Os*-AN, Ος Αν,) "will lose his life for my "sake shall find it." (ver. 25.) "*Who* So shall receive—*Who* So "shall offend," (*Os* EAN, Ος Εαν, Ο *d'* AN, Ο δ'Αν, Matt. xviii. 5, 6.) The Greek INA, (Ινα, Ut,) we now understand, when used as a Conjunction, has the same sense of *That*. Thus we see, how AN, EAN, EEN, (Αν, Εαν, Ην, Si,) INA, (Ινα, Ut,) EN, (Εν, In, Pro, Εις, In, quum significat in locum,) and EN, (Εν, Unum,) belong to each other. We have here the same relations under the Element ^N, which I shew to exist in the Element ^C^, ^D^, &c. C^, D^, &c. We shall instantly acknowledge the relation of EIS and EN, (Εις, Ad, et Εν, In, Ad,) to *Eis*, *En*, (Εις, Εν, Unus, Unum,) One, *This* or *That* Person or thing, just as I suppose AD to belong to ID.

We have seen, that the Greek SEA=*omai*, and THEA=*omai*, (Σεαομαι, Æol. Θεαομαι, Video,) belong to SEE, which I suppose to be attached to the Articular part of Speech under this form, as the Saxon and Gothic SE, SA, &c. and TO, THE, (Gr. Eng.) &c. It will now be understood, likewise, that THEA, (Θέα, Spectaculum, Θεὰ, Dea,) the Spectacle, and the Goddess, convey the same idea of THE—object; and thus we should conjecture, that in THEA, (Θεα,) and DEA, we have the original form, and that in THE=*os*, (Θεος,) DE=*us*, the *os* and *us* are derived from the construction of the

the Language. In DIA and ZEU, we should suppose the true form to exist; but in *Zeus*, (Ζευς, Jupiter,) the simple form does not appear. In SI=*os*, (Σιος, Deus, *Dor.* pro Θεος,) we have the S, as in SEA-*omai*, (Σεαομαι.) The Greek THEIA, (Θεια, Amita, Matertera,) means an Aunt, as denoting THE—distinguished personage; and hence we have, under the same form, THEI=*os*, (Θειος, Divinus, ad Deum pertinens, Θειος, Patris vel matris frater, avunculus, patruus,) THE—Divine personage, and THE—Honoured personage, the Uncle, &c. In the Dialects of the Celtic, among the terms for *Deus* in Lhuyd, are *Dyu*, *Deu*, *Due*, *Dia;* and we all remember the terms in modern Languages, *Dieu*, &c. There is however some difficulty respecting these words, which must be explained on another occasion.

We shall all agree, that among the various ideas, from which the term for *God* might be derived, the name of *Father;*—the word of reverence, would probably supply an important source. Those, who have written on the Theory of Languages, have imagined, that Infantine Sounds have afforded some of the original materials of Human Speech. Hence, as they say, the Labial sounds *Ab*, *Ap*, *Pa*, *Pa*, *Ma*, *Ma*, first uttered by Infants, have supplied the names for Father and Mother, through a great variety of Languages, as *Abu*, *Ubba*, &c. &c. &c. (Arabic, Heb. &c. &c.) *Mama*, *Papa*, &c., and PA=*Ter*, FA=*Ther*, MO=*Ther*, &c. &c. But not only, say they, have the Labial sounds supplied these names, but the sounds of the neighbouring organ, the Teeth, or the Dental Letters *T*, &c., have likewise furnished their assistance; and hence we have *Atta*, (Αττα, vox, quâ juniores senes compellant, sodes, amabo, Pater,) with its parallel terms, and *Taaut*, *Theut*, &c., *Tad*, *Taz*, *Dad*, &c. &c. (See *Mechanisme du Language*, Tom. I. p. 244, &c.) If, therefore, we should be inclined to imagine, that the Infantine sounds AT, ATTA, TA, TA, DA, DA, supplied the original materials for these names denoting Father,

and

and afterwards for *Being* or Person in general, *This* or *That* Being; such an opinion would not disturb my Hypothesis; but on the contrary, some of the facts, which I have noted, would rather be illustrated by that Hypothesis. We should then understand more particularly, why THEIA, and THEI=*os*, (Θεια, Amita, Matertera, Θειος, Avunculus, Patruus,) the names of Relations, are found among these terms; just as the Av in *Avunculus*, with its parallels, *Avus*, &c., belongs to the Labial Sounds for Father and Mother, *Aba*, &c. &c., and as *Patruus* belongs to *Pater*. We should hence perhaps be inclined to think, that *Theios*, (Θειος, Avunculus,) *Theos*, (Θεος,) *Zeus*, *Dis*, (Ζευς, Δις,) in Latin *Deus*, *Dis*, *Dit*-is, &c., were terms corresponding with *Tad*, *Dad*, &c., the names for Father, under one form; and that DIA, ZEU, (Δια, Ζευ,) DIA, (Ir.) THEIA, (Θεια,) &c. &c., corresponded with the names of Father, under another, as TA, DA, &c. This probably is the true way of conceiving the matter. Perhaps in *Eetheios*, (Ηθειος, Venerandus, colendus, Ηθειε, vox junioris ad seniorem reverentiæ causâ,) the true form is EETHIE, corresponding with ATTA. That the Greek *Tetta*, (Τεττα, vox quâ benevolentiæ aut honoris caussâ, junior seniorem compellat,) belongs to TAD, DAD, &c., we shall not doubt; and that *Tettix*, (Τεττιξ, Cicada,) is derived from the same source, we shall likewise agree. The comparison of old men to Grasshoppers is well known, Τεττιγεσσιν εοικοτες, &c. (Il. Γ. 151, &c.); and hence we understand the origin of the name of TITH=*onus*, the TAD, DAD, or old man, and why he is changed into a Grasshopper.

If the Reader, as I have observed, should conceive, in his Theory of Languages, that the Infantine sounds, AT, TA, DA, supplied the original materials for some, or even for all the words, under these forms; the series of facts, which I have exhibited, would not be disturbed by this Theory; nor would the relation, which I have supposed to exist between words, be affected, unless

unless in these peculiar instances, in which I have exhibited certain details, belonging rather to the *modus concipiendi*, than to the great essential points maintained in the Hypothesis. Under such a Theory, the Reader perhaps might imagine, that the Demonstrative parts of Speech would constitute the second step in the formation of Languages; and that Is, Hic, Iste, *This*, *That* Personage, and afterwards, either under the same form, or with some variety, Id, Hoc, *This*, *That* thing—Se, Sa, Ce, Sta, &c., (Sax. Goth. Fr. Ital. &c.) The Personage or thing, would be such terms as would immediately succeed the name of *Father*, &c. The name for the *Ground* or *Earth*, we may imagine, would soon be in existence, from whatever source it was derived; and the Estia, (Εστια,) Ge, De, Deo, (Γη, Δη, Terra, Δηω, Ceres,) Ce, (Ir.) &c. &c., we might conceive, according to this Hypothesis, would denote It, (Eng.) Is, Ist, (*Lat.* Locus,) Se, Sa, Ce, Sta, &c. &c., *This* or *That*—Place, object. We see, moreover, how the mode of declaring our ideas, which Grammarians denominate by the name of the verb, would be attached to this process; and how such words as Ata, Is, (Celt.) Is, (Eng.) Ist=*amai*, (Ισταμαι,) Est, (Lat.) Està, (Span.) ^Sta, (Ital.) Sta=^*t*, (Lat.) Ta, Si, Se, &c. (Celt. Sax. &c.) would perform the office of Verbs of Existence, as at once connected with terms denoting the *Ground*, or *Place*, and with *Demonstrative* parts of Speech. So far the Theory seems sufficiently compact and intelligible; and the Reader perhaps, on whose mind a direct similarity of form may make an impression, will be struck by observing, that the Celtic verbs Ata and Ta coincide in form with the name of Father, Ata, and the infantine sounds Ta, Ta. In exhibiting this Theory, I might suggest, likewise, that if, in some instances, the idea of *This* or *That*, as derived originally from *Being*, furnished the terms for *Place;* still it might happen, that by the same relation,

the idea of *Place* would afterwards supply words conveying the sense of *This* and *That.* From whatever source these words may be derived, or by whatever bonds of affinity they may be more particularly related; still, I imagine, we shall agree, that they are all to be referred to each other, and that the ideas of *This, That,* and of *Place*, are so intimately blended together, that it would be an idle labour to attempt their separation, and abhorrent from the discovery of such facts, which are found within our reach.

After this statement, I shall leave the Reader to follow that *modus concipiendi*, to which he shall be most inclined. I shall leave him to decide on the *Primitive* notion, as on a point of Theory, totally unconnected with the object of these discussions. I shall likewise submit to his decision those instances, in which the ideas annexed to *Place*, and to *Demonstrative* parts of Speech, *This—That,* are involved with each other; and I shall leave him to determine, whether the idea of *Place*, or of *This—That,* be the prevailing notion. Such an investigation would in many cases be precisely of the same kind, as if the Reader should attempt to adjust, whether in the adverbs of *Place*, as they are called, Hic and Huc, the idea of *Place* most prevailed, or that of the *Demonstrative* part of Speech; and if Hic could be proved to be originally derived from the notion of *Place*, the consideration would in fact then be, whether Hic and Huc partook most of their original or their secondary idea. The Reader may imagine, if he pleases, that the particle Ge, (Γε, *Particula*, Aliis vocibus fere adnecti solita, Certe, (2.) cum pronominibus, Quidem,) directly connects itself with its adjacent term, similar in form, Gea, Gee, (Γεα, Γη, Terra); and he may suppose too, if he pleases, that when these Particles are referred to a certain *Place*—'Such a *Place*, 'This or That *Place*,' that the idea of *Place* is the prevailing notion, as in 'Panta}Chou, Chee, (Παντα}χου, Παντα}χη,) Every}*Place*,'

or

or 'Every*W*} *here*,' as we express it, 'Every} *Here* and *There*,' if I may so say. The Reader, however, cannot but observe, that these explanatory terms, designating *Place* in our Language, *Where*, *Here*, *There*, are derived from *Demonstrative* parts of Speech, as I have before shewn. If we considered only De=*Uro*, (Δευρο, Huc, Adesdum,) and De=*Ute*, (Δευτε, Huc adeste,) we should be inclined to imagine, that the idea of *Place* prevailed, and that these words more directly connected themselves with the form De, (Δη, pro Γη,) the *Ground*; but when we remember, that De=*Uro* belongs to The=^*Re*, we see in The, how the *Demonstrative* idea exists. The same *Demonstrative* idea appears, likewise, in its adjacent term De=*Uter=os*, (Δευτερος, Secundus,) which I have shewn to signify The=*Other*. It is thus, that such ideas are entangled with each other. Even in Go and Kio, (Κιω,) as I have suggested on a former occasion, the same difficulty may be raised. The term Ge, (Γε,) though it appears to be attached to Gea, Gee, (Γεα, Γη,) the Ground, is still particularly connected with Pronouns, as with kindred parts of Speech, and is then best translated by *Quidem*, which, we know, belongs to the Pronoun *Quidam*. We have seen, moreover, in the course of these discussions, that the Greek Ge, (Γε,) appears to connect itself immediately with the Saxon Ge, the Gothic Ja, &c. &c., which removes us somewhat from the direct influence of the Greek Gea, (Γεα.) In considering the Celtic verbs Ata and Ta, we cannot but perceive how these forms ^T^, T^, with the breathing before the Radical Consonant, and with no breathing before it, connect themselves with each other. Still, however, we must remark, that these forms, when once existing, may be considered, under one point of view, as distinct and separate forms, generating a peculiar race of words, more directly related to each other.

Before I finish these notices on the Theory of Languages, I might

I might observe, that there is still another source, the principle of *Onomatopœia*, (Ονοματοποια, nominis seu vocabuli fictio, nominis fictio a sono,) which is supposed, likewise, by our Theorists, to have afforded materials for the formation of Human Speech. This principle will be considered in another place, when I shall examine those terms with which it appears to be most connected. I must again repeat, that these discussions, such as they are, about the *Theory* of Languages, have nothing to do with the discovery of those *facts*, which we are enabled to learn by patient and accurate investigation.—The name of the EARTH, ESTIA, (Εστια,) GE, (Γη,) &c., or, under other Elements, *Terra*, *Solum*, &c., when once existing, would equally exert its influence, and alike operate in the production of words, whatever might be the source from which that name was derived. It is not to be understood by this statement, that every Element, denoting the *Earth*, produces a race of words, conveying precisely the same turn of meaning: On the contrary, each Element may be considered to exhibit a characteristic turn of meaning, peculiar to itself, as derived either by accident from peculiar views in considering the same common object, or as impregnated, perhaps, with the peculiar idea, from which the name of that object was originally taken. Both these principles may probably have operated in producing the characteristic difference, which is attached to each Element. I must observe, moreover, that this peculiar turn of meaning can be exhibited in a series of indisputable and innumerable facts; though the *Primary cause* should be hidden from our view, and should be the object only of conjecture, unimportant even in the discovery of those truths, which are placed within the sphere of our researches. All, which has been supposed to relate to the Theory of Languages, refers only to a very few terms indeed, which on the present view of the question appear to have but little influence. Those terms, which have

have been imagined to be derived from the principle of *Onomatopœia*, perform no important part, and present themselves to our view, rather as capricious and insulated appendages to Language, which are removed from the sphere of its action, than as necessary and fundamental parts of its structure, which operate with energy and effect in the business of its formation. All, which concerns the *Theory* of Human Speech, may be exhausted within the compass of a few sentences or pages; while the *facts*, exhibiting the affinity of words to each other, must be acquired by the most minute examination of the various terms of which Languages are composed, and can be detailed only in long and laborious discussions, which must be recorded in many a bulky volume. I must add, likewise, that even the little, which can be said on the *Theory* of Languages, cannot be said with effect, till *all these facts* shall be fully discovered and ascertained.

Whatever Theory of Language the Reader may adopt, and whatever he may be disposed to think respecting the union of the terms denoting Being, under the forms ^C, &c. C^, &c., with the name for the EARTH, ESTIA, (Εστια,) he will probably think that all these terms must be considered as ultimately belonging to each other. The Writers on the Theory of Languages have collected the various words denoting *Father* and *Mother*, which appear under our Elements ^C, ^D, &c. C^, D^, &c.; though their enquiries have terminated at this point, nor have they appeared to imagine, that any other terms denoting Being, under different relations, are connected with such words. I shall detail some of the words for *Father* and *Mother*, under our Element ^C, ^D, &c. C^, D^, &c., which have been already collected by others: and if the Reader should be of opinion, that these words supplied the origin for the terms denoting Being, under the same Element, he will place them as the original and fundamental words belonging to that race of *Pronouns*,—

Articles,

Articles, &c., which have been the objects of our discussion, and which I have collected in a former page, (336, &c.)

The Author of the *Mechanisme du Language*, (Tom. I. p. 245, &c.) has the following article: "L' Egyptien, le Cophthe, " l'Africain d'Angola diront *Taaut*, *Theut*, *Thot*, *Tot*. Celui du " Congo *Tat*. Le Celtique, le Cimraëc, l' Armorique, le bas " Breton, le Gallois, le Cantabre diront *Taat*, *Taad*, *Tad*, *Tath*, " *Taz*, *Aita*. L' Irlandois *Nathair*. Le Gothique *Atta*. L'Epirote " *Atti*. Le Frison *Haite*. Le Valaque *Tatul*. L' Esclavon, le " Russe, le Polonois, le Bohemien, le Dalmate, le Croate, le " Vandale, le Bulgare, le Servite, le Carnique, le Lusacien, et " autres dérivés de l'ancien Illyrien, et de l'ancien Sarmate diront " *Ottse*, *Otsche*, *Otshe*, ou par corruption *Oieze*, *Wotzo*, *Wschzi*, " *Otsky*, *Wosche*, &c. Le Sauvage de la N. Zemble *Otose*. Le " Lapon *Atti*. Le Livonien, le Curlandois, le Prussien, le " Lithuanien, le Meklembourgeois, *Tabes*, *Tews*, *Thawe*, *Tewe*, " *Thewes* ou *Tabes*. Le Hongrois *Atyank*, *Atya*. Les Sauvages " du Canada, *Aistan*, *Aytan*, *Outa*, *Adatti*. Le Huron *Aihtaha*. " Le Groenlandois *Attata*. Le Sauvage de N. Angleterre *Oshe*. " Le Mexicain *Tahtli*. Le Brasilien *Tuba*. Le Kalmouk *Atey*. " Le Siberien *Atai*. Le Russe *Otetze*. Le Lapon *Otziæ*, &c. " Tous en se servant de la lettre de dent douce, moyenne ou " rude." In this collection, which is very negligently made, our Author, we see, has omitted the Greek ATTA, (Ατταˎ *Atta*,) *Tetta*, (Τεττα,) the English *Dad*, &c. &c. &c. In the same column of Mr. Shaw's Dictionary, where ATH*air*, a Father, occurs, we have "ATA, *Is*, Am," where we perceive, how the verb of Being is connected with these words. In Gothic, as ATTA signifies Father, AITHEI means likewise *Mater;* and in the same column of Lye's Saxon Dictionary, in which *Aithei* occurs, we have the Gothic AIRTHA, Terra.

Before I quit the Greek terms, beginning with Θ, Th, and having

having a vowel breathing after the Radical consonant, I ought not to omit the consideration of THEI=*on*, (Θειον, Sulphur,) which means perhaps THE—Substance, THEO, THEO, (Θεω, Curro, Θεω, Pono,) 'To Run, and to Place,' which might seem to bring us to the Ground; and yet they might be derived from the idea of 'THE—brisk, lively, action,' and from that of 'THE=*ing*,' if I may so express it, or 'Putting in THE—*This* or *That* situation.' The Greek THUO, (Θυω, Sacrifico;—Cum impetu quasi furibundus feror, ruo, festino; Furo; Ferveo, Æstuo,) relates perhaps to the 'THE—brisk violent action,' from whatever idea it may be derived. I will not pretend to decide, that such is the notion annexed to these terms; but I must observe, that the intensive Particle or Article, under the form C^, D^, &c., has certainly supplied verbs, which relate to Intensive actions, as will appear in the course of this discussion. Whether the English term Do, with its parallels THUE, (Germ.) &c., belongs to the Article, I cannot decide. In Gothic, the parallel term, as it should seem, to *Do*, appears under the form TG, as *Taugan*, Facere; and this would lead us to think that Do belongs to the Element TG. The Latin Do, and the English Do, must surely be referred to each other, whatever may have been their origin. The Greek DUO, (Δυω, Subeo, ingredior; occido; Induo,) and the DUO in *In*=DUO, must likewise, I think, be referred to Do, (Eng.) In the sense of *Occido*, we see 'THE—action—of violence,' &c. as in the English Do; and in the sense of *In*=DUO, we have the use of Do in our colloquial phrase, 'To *Don* and *Doff*,' as applied to cloaths, 'To Do—on and off.' In Doo, (Δοω,) from which *Didomi*, (Διδωμι,) is supposed to be derived, we have the form of the Latin Do, and perhaps the DI=Do in *Didomi*, (Διδωμι,) as well as the TI=THE in *Tithemi*, (Τιθημι,) may represent the reduplication of the same terms expressing the action of the verb. The

analogy

analogy of the verbs in Mi, as they are called, which the Grammarians detail to us, may have arisen from these very examples. We seem to perceive the same reduplication in the Latin De=Di, and De=Do, and a further addition by the same analogy, perhaps, in De=Di=Di. We see the original sense of the Latin Do, as corresponding with the English Do, in such phrases as 'Dare amplexus, cantus,' &c. 'To Do embracings, 'singings,' &c. In the Laws of the Twelve Tables, we have "Si quis hominem liberum—morti *Duit*," which precisely coincides with the use of Do in our ancient expression "Done *to* "*Death*;"

> "Done *to Death* by slanderous tongues,
> "Was the Hero that here lies." (*Much Ado about Nothing.*)

where Mr. Malone has justly observed, that "this obsolete "phrase frequently occurs in our ancient dramas.". We have seen, that in Saxon, as in English, The is one form of the Article; and in the same opening of my Saxon Dictionary, we have The=*an*, or The=*on*, "Proficere, vigere, pollere, pu-"bescere, adolescere," which surely connects itself with the Intensive word The. This idea of verbs being derived from Pronominal parts of Speech, under the form C^, D^, &c. with the breathing after the Radical Consonants, denoting The, *This*, *That*, &c., will receive illustration from the Hebrew Pronominal parts of Speech, and Particles, which I shall take this occasion of examining. It must be observed however, that some of these terms may be referred to the Element TS, SS, &c.; and under that idea, the Radical form of these Greek verbs *Thuo*, (Θυω, &c.) would be found, in the future, *Thuso*, (Θυσω.) In many terms, not produced on this occasion, which appear under the form C^, D^, &c., this difficulty presents itself. If the Doo, (Δοω,) should be conceived to be the true Elementary form, perhaps some might imagine, that

that it belongs to the form DE, DEO, (Δη, Pro Γη, Terra, Δηω, Ceres,) as in Ζειδωρος Αρουρα, which is equally applicable, whether we regard Δωρον as belonging to Δοω, or not.

HEBREW PRONOMINAL PARTICLES AND PRONOUNS.

IN examining the Hebrew Pronominal Particles, (if I may so express it,) and some of the Pronouns, which belong to our Element ^C^, ^D^, &c. or C^, D^, I shall first consider those, with the breathing after the Radical Consonant; as they directly connect themselves with the form of the words, and with the ideas, now under discussion. In Hebrew, ש S^ is used as a Conjunction, denoting "*That*—For—Because—When," &c. &c. It is applied in the same sense as אשר ASR, says Mr. Parkhurst, of which word, or of יש IS, denoting Is, (Eng.) he considers it as an abbreviation. The form of S^, ש corresponds with כה CH, "Thus, In this Manner,—Here,—As, Like As, About—Surely, "Yea, Because, For, Therefore, for *That* reason, When,—But, "Though," as Mr. Parkhurst explains it in its different senses. Here we see to what various purposes the idea conveyed by *That* is applied. Another form of these words, ש S^, and CH, כה is זה ZH, "This, This here.—A certain one," &c. &c. The latter word ZH, זה says Mr. Parkhurst, "Like Ουτος in Greek, (see "Acts x. 36.) and *Hic* in Latin, sometimes imports *Eminence*— "Distinction, *Pre-eminence*." Another form of זה ZH, is זוה ZUH, which occurs not as a verb in Hebrew, says Mr. Parkhurst; but in Arabic, זוי ZUI, signifies "to verge, tend or incline towards a "certain point, 'vergebat, tendebat *Eo*, petebat *Illud*,'" where in *Eo* and *Illud* we see the original idea. The same word means an "*Angle, Corner*, (i. e. the *Inclination* of two lines, planes, &c. "to each other,) whence the verb is used in the derivative senses

" of *thrusting into corners, hiding, laying up,*" &c., as Mr. Parkhurst explains it. Hence the word means, in one sense, מזוי M=ZUI, " Store=Houses, where things are *hidden* or *laid up.*" In another sense we have the primitive notion, זאת זה זו ZU, ZH, ZAT, *This, This Here.*" Mr. Parkhurst has noted the coincidence of the term under such a meaning with זה ZH, before produced, and suggested, that the sense of the Demonstrative Pronouns may belong to the Root זוה ZUH, " as denoting the *tendency* of our " own, or the *directing* of another's mind to a certain object."

Adjacent to the word זה ZH, *This* or *That*, we have זי ZI, which, as Mr. Parkhurst says, "occurs not as V. in Heb. nor (so " far as I can find) in the Eastern Dialectical Languages; but " the idea is *To be Bright, Splendid*, &c., and hence the Greek " Ζεω, *To be fervid, hot.*" The sense of *Splendor*, attached to the Hebrew term, certainly belongs to the idea of THE—*Distinguished* object; and the Greek ZEO, (Ζεω, Ferveo,) is perhaps attached to the same idea. In examining this word in my Greek Vocabulary, I cast my eyes on ZAO, (Ζαω, Vigeo, Vivo,) which we shall certainly imagine to be derived from the same source; and every thing tends to confirm this opinion. The succeeding word to *Zao*, (Ζαω,) in this Vocabulary, is ZEA or ZEIA, (Ζεα, *Zea*, Far, &c. Ζειω, idem,) which perhaps means THE—Precious production, by way of *Distinction*, or it directly belongs to the GEE, (Γη,) DEE, (Δη, Terra,) the Ground. In the combination ZEI=*Doros*, (Ζειδωρος, Fertilis, Almus,) a term expressing the Blessings of Fertility, we are indeed brought to the Ground; but here the ZEI may be intensive. We shall probably be confirmed in our opinion, that these terms are derived from some *Intensive* sense, when we remember an adjacent word, which is directly adopted as an Intensive Particle,—ZA, (Ζα, Particula inseparabilis, *Augens* significationem, ut Ζαπλουτος, Valde dives.) Here we have the very idea, supposed in my Hypothesis; and I shew in another place,

place, that ZA is THE. The Hebrew word זי ZI, means likewise "The *Olive* tree and fruit, q.d. The *Splendour* tree and fruit, so "called from producing *Oil*," says Mr. Parkhurst, "which sup-"ports the action of fire in *Light* and *Splendour*." The ZI, as denoting the *Olive*, is THE—Distinguished Tree. Our Lexicographer imagines, that *Olea*, the *Olive*, and its parallel terms, belong to the Hebrew הל HL, signifying To Shine. Perhaps *Olea*, &c. is attached to the Element ^L, for the same reason, as denoting *The*—Tree, ILLA Arbor. Whether the Hebrew word 'To Shine' is derived from a similar idea, must be the subject of enquiry in another place.

In Hebrew, זז ZZ, or זיז ZIZ, means "An animal moving or "endued with Motion, Whatever Moveth, *παν το κινουμενον*." Perhaps this idea of *Life* and *Motion* may belong to זי ZI, זה ZH. Nothing is so common in Hebrew, as to double a letter, expressing a certain idea, in order to make that idea more forceable. Now the Hebrew שש SS has a similar meaning, "To be brisk, "active, sprightly, chearful;" where perhaps we may have a similar reduplication of ש S, "The person or thing THAT,—"*Who? Which?*" as Mr. Parkhurst explains it. It is curious, that we should find attached to the word כה CH, *This* and *That*, terms with a similar meaning to those, which are annexed to זה ZA, *That*. We have כוה CUH, "To Burn, Scorch, as Fire," where the term is applied to the *Burning* of Fire, as זי ZI is to its *Brightness*. The term כח CCH, means 'To be strong, 'vigorous, firm,' which may be a reduplication of כ C. Mr. Parkhurst refers to this Hebrew word כוה CUH, the Greek KAIO, (*Καιω*, *Καυσω*,) and the English *Caustic*, &c. The Greek and Hebrew words may perhaps belong to each other. The Hebrew חיה *ChIH*, "*To be strong and vigorous*," we shall now understand to be only another of these words, זי ZI, &c. It signifies, likewise, "To Live," and, as a substantive, "*A Living creature, An Animal.*"

We

We perceive, how this word coincides in idea with ZAO, (Ζαω, Vigeo, Vivo,) and with the Saxon THE=*an*, Proficere, Vigere, pollere, pubescere, adolescere, and with the Latin QUEO, "To be "able, to may or can." I do not affirm, that these terms directly belong to each other; but I mean to assert, that they belong to the same idea—THE—*This* or *That*—distinguished person or thing—the QUI—the *That That*, &c. &c. &c.

I shall now examine some Hebrew Particles, &c. which have not been so particularly discussed in the preceding enquiry, under the form ^C, ^D, &c. It will be necessary to note, likewise, the corresponding Pronominal parts of Speech in this Language, under the same form. We have seen, that the Latin AD has been referred by the Etymologists to the Hebrew עד OD, "AD, "*Usque*=AD," says Martinius. Mr. Parkhurst explains this word by "YET, *still—Besides, moreover, Again, yet again, More—* "*Until, To, Unto*,—Repeated *Both, And;*" and in one sense of the word, as our Author observes, "it is used almost like a N. "*Any other, any else*," where we see it in its original Pronoun state. Mr. Parkhurst has justly pointed out its correspondence with the Greek ETI, (Ετι,) and Eoos, (Εως,) in the versions of the Septuagint and Symmachus; and he refers to it the Saxon *Gyt*, the English *Yet*, the Latin *Ad*, and the English *At*. The Hebrew word denotes likewise, "*Timeforeward, futurity, Eternity to come*," which mean '*That* or *Yon* period—*Unto* which we proceed.' It denotes, likewise, "To bear witness, testify;" and as a Noun, "A witness or testimony—a Sign, as the Rainbow, Moon," &c., which means '*That* remarkable object, AT which men look, 'ID, AD quod homines respiciunt.' The same Hebrew term אדד ADD, signifies, moreover, "To preserve or continue still, i. e. in "being or safety;" where we have the original idea of *Place—Situation*, or of any thing *Placed—Situated*; from which idea, as I conceive, these terms, denoting *This* or *That Existing* being

or

or thing—*This*—*That*, &c., have been derived. In one passage of the Psalms, it is translated by "*Stand* upright;" and by this word, Taylor explains it; where we see the same metaphor as in *Existo Sisto*, &c. The succeeding word in Mr. Parkhurst's Lexicon, is עדה ODH, "To Pass over or upon, as a path or way.—"To cause to pass upon, to put on," as ornaments; where we seem likewise to have the more original sense of *Place*, or of going from *Place* to *Place*—To *Place* it, if I may so say, as applied to motion, and To *Place* or *Put*—on a garment. The term, we see, belongs to עד OD, and agrees with it even in the secondary sense, which עד OD bears of AD or *To;* as we might explain עדה ODH, by 'To AD or TO, To *On*, or *Unto*,' if I may so express it, *Ire* AD *locum*—To pass TO—*On, Unto*, a certain spot.

There is however a parallel term to these words, which will unequivocally determine their original sense. This term is אתה ATH, (in Chaldee אתא ATA,) which, according to Mr. Parkhurst, means, in its first sense, "To come, to come TO, come "near, approach, come speedily,"—and in its second sense, we have אות AUT, "A Sign, Token," which senses agree with the significations of the preceding terms; but the same word אתי אתה את AT, ATH, ATI, is used as a Pronominal and Articular part of Speech, denoting *Thou, Me*, and *The, The* Very; and it is adopted likewise as a Preposition, signifying "With, "To, Towards." We here see that precise union of ideas between *The* and *To* in the same word, which my Hypothesis supposes. This example alone would be decisive of the question. The Hebrew את AT means, moreover, a *Coulter*, which Mr. Parkhurst supposes to be so called, because it "*comes before* the plough-"share in ploughing." Whatever be the precise idea, by which it is connected with the other senses of the word; we perceive, that we are directly brought to the very spot, from which, as

I imagine,

I imagine, all these terms are ultimately taken. Mr. Parkhurst enumerates, among the derivatives of this Hebrew word, "*At*, "*With, The, Thee, Thou;*" and all these terms, if we except *With*, assuredly belong to it, and to each other. It would be idle, however, to select any one of these terms as the original, and to consider the others as Derivatives. Mr. Parkhurst produces, under this Hebrew word, the following passage, in order to illustrate its Intensive or Articular sense, and to shew the faulty translation of our version. In the fourth chapter of Genesis we have, "And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, "and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a *Man from the Lord*," איש את יהוה AIS AT JHUH; where our Translators have considered AT as denoting *From*,—a sense, which, as Mr. Parkhurst imagines, it cannot bear on this occasion. Dr. Geddes translates it by "I have acquired a godlike man-child;" on which Mr. Parkhurst observes, "But surely the incommunicable name יהוה" JHUH, "must not be degraded to the sense of *Godlike;*" and he accordingly imagines, that it means "The *very*, or even *Jehovah;* "referring to the evangelical promise, Gen. iii. 15. *of the seed of* "*the woman, who should bruise the serpent's head;* which promise, "however, it is plain, from her mistake, she did not perfectly "comprehend." This interpretation, I imagine, will not be adopted, though the sense given to את AT, is just. Let us mark the Hebrew words AISH, and AT, the terms for Man, and THE—'THE VERY-*Godlike*,' which, we see, belong to each other, and to the Latin Is, the English IT, &c.; and I have already examined the Hebrew ישה or יש ISH, IS, Existence, Is, (Eng.) &c., to which איש AIS, Man, is referred. We have a similar form, אש AS, which signifies Fire, and sometimes, perhaps, Is; and Mr. Parkhurst, under this word, produces a Chaldee term, denoting *Foundations*, where we are brought to the primitive notion, supposed in my Hypothesis. Perhaps the sense of Fire may belong

belong to the idea of 'THE—*That*—Powerful, Extraordinary, 'Element;' and Mr. Parkhurst has accordingly referred this word to the term יש Being, Substance. If such should be the fact, the words denoting Fire, belonging to our Element, as IG*nis*, &c., should perhaps be referred to the same idea. I produce, however, these terms for *Fire*, under a race of words denoting *Agitation*, &c., which is likewise a very probable idea.

In the same opening of Mr. Parkhurst's Lexicon, where אתה ATH is, we have ASR, אשר which means, in its first sense, as Mr. Parkhurst supposes, "To proceed, go forward, to be suc- "cessful, prosperous;" and in another sense it means, "Who, "Which, Whom," "a Relative word," as this Lexicographer explains it, "referring to somewhat going before, either expressed "or understood; and so causing the sentence to *Proceed* or "*Go forward* without interruption or repetition."—The sense of *Prosperous—Happy*, means only THE or THAT Personage, by way of Distinction—The Prosperous—Happy Personage, just as QUEO, QUI=*Ens*, denoting *Powerful*, Able, belongs to QUI. The term ASR likewise means, as a Conjunction, *That*, and is used in various manners for *Because*, *As*, *When*, *Where*, which Mr. Parkhurst has duly referred to the original sense of THAT, in his explanations, "For the cause THAT—Because THAT—In the "manner THAT, *As*—At the time THAT, *When*, The place "THAT, *Where*," &c.; and here again we see how Conjunctions, with apparently different senses, may belong to the idea of THAT. The Hebrew *AS*=^*R* is probably a compound of the Element ^S=^R. In the opening of the Psalms we have three words belonging to each other, applied in their different senses, "*Blessed* is *The Man That*," אשרי האיש אשר ASRI HAIS ASR, which is the same as if it had been 'Is,' (quasi δεικτικως,) 'Is—Homo, Is—*Qui*,' or, as it might have been, 'QUI=*Ens*, QUI—Homo, (vel *Ali*QUI=^*S*,) QUI.' And thus it is, that Languages have been formed. In Hebrew,

אז AZ means, as a Noun and Particle, "AT *That* time, then—"AT *This* time, Now.—AT *That* point of time," as Mr. Parkhurst explains it; where we have the ideas combined, of AT and *This—That*, which I suppose in my Hypothesis. Our Author seems doubtful whether he should consider it as a Pronoun or a Particle. In Hebrew, likewise, איך AIK is a particle denoting "In what "manner,—By what means, Where;" and here we have still the same meaning, "In the Manner, THAT." Mr. Parkhurst supposes it to be a compound of אי AJ, Where, and כה KH, Thus or Here; which may possibly be the fact, though it may perhaps be the simple form, belonging to the Element ^K, with the breathing before it. We have, however, a compound in איככה *AIK=KH*. There is another particle AK, אך signifying "Indeed—Surely," or in *This* or *That* very manner. Mr. Parkhurst describes it by "A Particle denoting that the speaker is *very earnest, much moved*, "or as we say, *greatly struck*, and accordingly it may be regularly "deduced from נכה" NKH, "to strike, as אט" AT, "from נטה" NTH. On the origin of the Hebrew אט AT, denoting Stooping, as Mr. Parkhurst supposes, or *Slowly, Gently*, as others, I cannot accurately decide.

The preceding term to this in Mr. Parkhurst's Lexicon is אחר A*Ch*R, "*Behind*, *After*, either of place, or time," which perhaps may be another form of ASR, and may mean only *This—That*. The term *Be=Hind* certainly means 'Be=*Yond*,' or 'Be=*Yon*' Situation. In one of the senses, Mr. Parkhurst explains it by "*Another*, i.e. *One*, in some respect, *after* or *posterior*;" and he derives from it *After* and *Other*, where in OTHER we see the idea, which coincides with my Hypothesis. Mr, Richardson has placed in separate articles اخر AKHAR, "Another, a Second," and اخر AKHIR, "Last, posterior, ultimate, final." In the next column of his Dictionary, he has اخرت AKHIR*et*, "Posterior, last.—The "Extremity.—Life eternal; the other world;" and he adds,

"*Akhiret*

"*Akhiret* is always opposed by the Arabians to دنيا" *Dnya*, "which signifies, The world or the present Life; synonimous to "which the Persians make use also of اين جهان" *Ain Jhan*, "*This* world, and ان جهان" *An Jhan*, "*That* world." The Hebrew אחר AChR, is used somewhat in a similar manner; and Mr. Parkhurst has referred it to ACHERON, "the name of one of "the infernal rivers, in the Greek and Roman Mythology;" or the River of the *Other* world. We cannot but note in all this, how the idea of a Future World is marked by the Demonstrative or Distinctive Pronouns *That—Other;* and such might be the origin of AChR. If such should be the fact, it will be the same compound as in OTH=ER, ET=ER-*os*, (Ετερος); yet on this point there is some difficulty. If *Ach=Er=On* should be derived from this idea, the ON must be considered as belonging to the Element ^N, bearing the same meaning. It is curious, that the same mode of speaking occurs among the Greeks, who, in order to express a Future or the *Other* World, have adopted the Demonstrative term EKEI, (Εκει,) *That*—place, *There*. We all remember the address to Death in the last Speech of Ajax:

Ω Θανατε, Θανατε, νυν μ' επισκεψαι μολων·
Και τοι σε μεν KAKEI προσαυδησω ξυνων.

"O Mors, Mors, nunc accedens me specta;
"Etsi te quidem, et *Illic* cohabitans tibi alloquar."

The Critics have been aware of this peculiarity of expression; and have produced, on different occasions, various instances of its use.

CELTIC PARTICLES AND PRONOUNS.

THOUGH I have perpetually appealed to the Celtic forms of Speech in the preceding Enquiries, concerning the nature of the Pronouns, and the terms directly belonging to them, as

the Conjunctions—Prepositions, &c.; yet I shall here more particularly consider these Dialects, and endeavour to explain the mode, in which the process of composition has operated in the formation of such parts of Speech. I shall not however attempt to examine every instance, in which this composition occurs; but shall make only such general observations, as will enable the Celtic Scholar at once to unravel other examples of a similar kind. Some of these compounds are understood, but on others, I imagine, no just conceptions have been formed. In the Irish and Galic Dialects, Me, Mi, Tu, Se, Ise, &c. are simple states denoting *I*, *Thou*, and *He*, as we have before seen. Inn, in Irish, signifies *We;* and it corresponds with terms in other Languages, bearing the same idea, as Uns, (Goth.) &c. &c. which I have before produced; but S^=Inn, We, is a compound of Se and Inn. Ibb and S=Ibb in these Dialects signify *Ye*, where in the latter word we have another compound, corresponding with S^=Ibi, (Lat.) and various other terms, as I have before shewn. In Irish and Galic, Iad means *They:* In the former Language, S^=Iad signifies, likewise, *They;* and in the latter, Id=Se, which is quasi Iad=Se; where we have combinations of Se and Iad in a contrary order. An, in both these Dialects, is the familiar Article, as in the English *An;* and in the Plural we have *Na*, where the breathing before the N is lost. In *Na*=^*N*, the Genitive plural, we have a combination of *Na* and *An*. In these Dialects, Cia, Ce, Co, Ciu, Ci=Od, &c. signify 'Who, Which, What;' and So, Sa, Su, S=In, &c. 'That, There;' S^=An, S^=On, &c. 'His;' Ud, Od, S^=UD, 'This, That,' &c. &c.—Ti, Te, 'He, the Man.'—In the same Dialects, Cia means likewise "A Man, Husband." I have already noticed the composition of G=^Ach, *Every;* and compared it with other terms. In Galic, we have Eile, Another, belonging to Al*ius*, &c., and Chu=Ile, 'All, every,' which is probably in this instance a compound of C^=Eile. The Ci=Od

is

is a similar composition to *Qu=Id*, *Qu=Od*, &c. Mi=Se means 'I,' or 'I myself,' from which the Latin Me=T, the addition to Pronouns, seems to be directly taken, as *Ego*=Met; where it is applied in its original sense, though it was afterwards added on other occasions, as *Nos*=Met.

In Galic, *Cheudna* means *Same*, where we have a composition of *Che=Ud=Na*. In these Dialects, *Ceud* is the First, and a Hundred, which is surely a composition of Ce=Ud. Having proceeded thus far, the Celtic Scholar might be tempted to conjecture, that the terms for the *First*,—the *Head*, &c., and a *Hundred*, under the forms CN, might be likewise compounds, similar to S^=In, *That*, as the Galic *Cean*, the Head, the Welsh *Cyn*, the First, &c. &c. He would likewise, perhaps, conjecture, by the same mode of reasoning, that the name for a Hundred, under the Element CN, was a similar composition, as the Galic *Ceanan*, *Ceanair*, the Welsh *Cant*, the Latin *Centum*, &c. &c. &c. If the Greek *Ekaton*, (Εκατον,) is not quasi *Ekton*, with the Kton belonging to Cent*um*, perhaps we should imagine, that Ek=At=On was a composition of the Element ^K, ^T, and of ^N, in order to express the greatness of the number, quasi *That—That*, &c. number, by way of distinction. I dare not venture to conjecture, that such is the origin of *Cyn*, &c., as the process of composition would then proceed to an extent, to which we should with difficulty raise our conceptions, in the present state of the discussion. Through the whole compass of Language the form CN denotes the *Top—Head—First—Chief*, &c.; and this idea seems to be deeply involved with the great race of words, appearing under that form.

Before however I quit this form, I must exhibit a few terms, which are, I think, unequivocally derived from the process of composition. In the same column of Mr. Shaw's Dictionary, where *Ceann*, the 'Head,' is found, we have "Ce=Ana, Alike, the "Same,"

" Same," and " CE=ANA, Even, lo, already," which is a similar composition of Pronouns, denoting *This* or *That*, as in *Ce=Ud*, *Idem* or *Id-Dem*, *O Autos*, (ο αυτος,) and *S^=Ame*, which I have shewn likewise to be a compound. In Welsh, C^=AN or G^=AN signifies " Because, forasmuch as, since *That*," which is another of these combinations; where, in the interpretation *As—That*, we see the original idea of the compounding Pronouns. These words are likewise used as Prepositions signifying "With, Of." The Welsh C^=AN=Ys, " For, Because," exhibits an additional part Ys. Mr. Richards explains G^=AN in another place by " Forasmuch as, " Whereas." Let us mark the compound *Where=As*, in which *Where* signifies *That—That*, (In *That* Place *That*,) and *As* bears a similar meaning of *That*. Let us likewise mark the explanatory word *S=Ince*, which I have shewn to be a similar compound. The same term G=AN, which in the Welsh Dialect of the Celtic signifies *With*, in other Dialects denotes *With-out*, as the Irish GAN. In all this there is no difficulty; as the senses of *With* or *Without* express merely *This* situation and *That*. But whatever may be the precise mode, by which the ideas of *With* and *That* are united; we unequivocally see, how the idea of *That* is connected with GAN as a Conjunction; and we cannot doubt, that the Preposition and Conjunction are the same. We now see, that the Latin S=IN and S=INE belong to each other, and that they are compositions of a similar kind to the Celtic S=IN, *That*, G=AN, 'Without.'

The Prepositions in the Celtic Dialects, which are familiarly joined with the Pronouns, originally performed, as I imagine, the office of Demonstrative parts of Speech. Thus we have belonging to our Element, with the breathing before and after the Radical Consonant, AG, AIG, UAIDH, As, Do, D*h*, GU or CHU, or, when compounded, GU=S, CHU=G, &c. When joined to Pronouns we have *Agibh*, *Asibh*, *Dhibh*, *Chugibb*, or AG, As, Dh^, CHUG}*Ibh*,

'*At*,

'*At*, Out, From, *To* You.' Let us mark the terms AT and To, respectively corresponding with AIG and Do. The Preposition AIR, *Upon*, belongs to the Element ^R, denoting the Ground, as UIR, (Gal.) "Mould, Earth, Dust," as Mr. Shaw explains it; the Greek ERA, (Ερα, Terra,) AR-OURA, (Αρουρα,) &c. &c. With the idea of *Upon*—the *Top*—the *Surface*, is connected that of the *Superior* Personage—The Distinguished Personage; and hence we have the Armoric and Welsh Articles AR, YR. Hence the sense of the Preposition AIR, *Upon*, the *Superior* Part, is so entangled with the sense of The *Superior* Personage—*The*—*This* or *That* Distinguished Person or object, that oftentimes we cannot separate the one from the other. Without stopping to adjust on every occasion the precise idea annexed to the Element ^R, I shall exhibit various terms which belongs to each other, under this Element; and which present themselves to our attention in the consideration of the Celtic Particles. The terms TH ^=AR, TH ^=AR=IS, Over, are compounds. Among the terms for *Iterum*, we have the Cornish *Arta*, the Armoric *Adarre*, the Irish *Athair*, which seem to be compounds of ATH, AITH, Again, and *Thar*. We perceive, that ITER*um* belongs to ATHAIR, &c.; and yet ITER*um* seems to connect itself with ITER, which belongs surely to IT, (Lat.) In Celtic, we have words, under the same form as *Iter*, bearing the same meaning. Among the terms for ITER in Lhuyd, we have *Astar*, *Eaχtar*. The particle RI, *To*, is AR, with the breathing after the R^; and AR=IS, RI=S, *Again*, are compounds. RO, "Very, "Too," belongs to *Ri*, To. I have shewn, that To and Too belong to each other, and to the Article or Intensive term THE. I must leave the Celtic Scholars to decide, whether *Re* and *Ro* are related to each other by the same process.

The Latin *Re* belongs to these terms RI, RO, AR=*Is*, &c.; and we perhaps see the true sense in the future of *Rus*, as it is called; where,

where, in Amat-UR=Us, the UR seems to signify 'THE Being, 'Loving.' The Latin RE coincides in sense with Ro, *Very*, when it denotes *Abundance*, as RE*dundo*, To *Over*flow. In the Greek ERI, and ARI, (Ερι, particula, augens significationem vocum, cum quibus componitur, Αρι, Particula inseparabilis, quæ vocabulis præfixa, significationem eorum auget per Valde, Vehementer, &c.) ARA, (Αρα, Utique, Nempe, &c., An, Utrum,) we have the full form with the breathing before and after the ^R^; but in AR, (Αρ, apud Poëtas pro Αρα,) and RA, (Conjunct. Expletiva, Certe, Utique,) we see the Celtic forms. Let us mark the explanatory term 'Utique,' where the *Uti* belongs to UT, ID, *That;* and we have likewise QUE added, which belongs to the Pronoun QUI, *That.* In Irish, UIR added to nouns means Very, as UIR*isioll*, *Very* Humble. The Etymologists doubt, whether *Re* or *Retro* be the original. The *Tro* is the same as the *Tro*, *Tra*, and *Ter*, in *In*} *Tro*, *Tra*, *Ter*, *Tra*=^*Ns;* and it belongs probably to *Terra*, unless we should imagine, that it is the same compound as *Th*^=*Air.* In the Dialects of the Celtic, *Dra*, *Tra*, *Tar*, &c. signify *Beyond;* and in these Dialects, likewise, *Daiar*, *Tyr*, &c. mean *Terra.* Can we imagine, that the name for the *Ground*, as DAIAR, TYR, TERRA, is itself a composition from TH=AIR? If this should be the fact, my Hypothesis will still remain the same, that Languages, or the terms forming the great body of Human Speech, are derived from the Ground. If the name for the Ground, as DAIAR, &c., had not existed, the Element DR, TR, &c. would have supplied only a few terms. I have exhibited the prepositions produced above, AG, AIG, &c., as they are written by Mr. Shaw in the Galic Dialect; but the Celtic Scholar will at once apply them to the parallel terms which appear in other Dialects, and which I do not think it necessary to produce. AG and AIR are used in the formation of verbs; and General Vallancey has expressly represented them under the idea

idea of "Participial *Articles*," which coincides with my Hypothesis. He observes, that "AG and AR are *Participial Articles* of the "Present tense, IAR, of the Preter, and AR TI of the Future, as "AG *Radh*, Saying, IAR *Radh*, Having Said." The AG and AR mean 'The Person, or Being,' as ED does in *Lov*=ED, and as ING in *Lov*=ING. The ING, we know, belongs to the AN, &c. the Article, as *Love*=AN, *Love*=ONE, 'The AN or ONE who Loves.'

The Irish IAR belongs to the ER in *Lov*=ER, and OR in *Amat*=OR. In Galic, OIR or AIR may be almost considered as a participial termination. Mr. Shaw observes, that "Agents or "doers subjoin OIR, and sometimes AIR, to the present participle "of verbs, as *Scriobadh*, Writing, *Scriobhad*OIR, a *Writ*=ER, &c.— "or by changing the termination into OIR, as *Cruthich*=OIR, the "*Creat*=OR, from *Cruthuchadh*, a Creating." Mr. Shaw adds, that "Some write the termination *Fhear* in place of *Oir*, affecting "an idle knowledge in the Etymology of words, at the expence "of hurting the eye of every Reader with the bristly appearance "of an useless assemblage of consonants;" and Mr. Shaw imagines, that *Fhear* added thus to words would be the same, as if we should write in Latin *Amat*=VIR, for *Amat*=OR. Mr. Shaw, we see, supposes, that the *Oir* and *Fhear* belong to each other, and to *Vir*. This I suppose likewise; but here some difficulty presents itself. The *Fhear* and *Vir* may be derived from the Element ^R, OIR, by the organical addition of the *f*, *v*; or the *Fhe*=*Ar*, and *V*^=*Ir*, may be a compound of the Elements F^ and ^R, as we have seen *P*^=*As*, *P*=*An*, &c. to be compounds of the same Element F^, P^, and of ^S, ^N. We may likewise consider the matter under this point of view. We cannot, I think, doubt, that the Celtic terms for Man, *Gur* and *Fhear*, are only different forms of each other; and if that should be the fact, we may suppose, that GU and FHE, in the compounds *Gu*=^*R*, *Fhe*=*Ar*, belong to each other, as QUI belongs to *Who*.

The

The Greek particle *Per*, (Περ, Particula, sive Conjunct. expletiva, aliis orationis partibus annecti solita, quæ—Notat *Quamquam*, *Tametsi*, respondet particulæ *Cumque*;—redundat,) certainly belongs to a race of words denoting *This* or *That* Being; and it is used in its original idea, when it is annexed to Pronouns, as *Os*=PER, (Οσπερ.) I must observe too, that *P^=ER*, (Περ,) seems to have arisen from the process of composition.

I have suggested, that the Greek *T^=In*-os, and *D^=Eina*, (Τινος, Δεινα,) are compounds; and that possibly another familiar Celtic term for Man, as *Duine*, may be likewise a compound of the Elements D^=^N; but here too some difficulties occur. Those, who examine the Welsh *Dyn*, "A man, a person," in a Dictionary of that Language, and consider the adjacent *Dyna*, or D^=YNA, 'Lo there!' which the Lexicographers themselves allow to be a compound of DY and YNA, will be disposed to imagine D^=YN, the *Man*, to be a compound of a similar kind. The Welsh DY, "the preposition in composition, augmenting "and enhancing the signification—DI, the privative particle, and "DE, the particle for enchancing or altering the signification a "little," still mean THE, and belong to DE—DI, &c. &c. of the Latins, &c. &c. before unfolded, (p. 467.) DI is used in Welsh for TI, *Thou*, where it is directly applied to person. The Welsh DA, Good, may perhaps mean DE, the Distinguished Personage; and the adjacent term to DE in Mr. Richards' Dictionary, DEHAU, "RIGHT, the Right hand," &c., might perhaps mean THE—quarter. This however will bring us to the Latin *Dexter*, and the Greek *Dexios*, (Δεξιος,) in which there is some difficulty. In the Greek *Outi*-DAN-*os*, (Ουτιδανος, Homo nullius pretii,) and in O TAN, (Οταν, amice,) we see the DEINA and TIN in TIN=*os*.

Let us mark, in the expression *Ar* TI, the word TI, which bears a similar sense of *This—That*. Mr. Shaw explains TI in one article by "He, He who, Him that;" and in another article by

by "Unto, To." If we are not willing to suppose, that THE and To, in English, belong to the Celtic TI, we see from TI how THE and To may be only different forms of each other. In another article of Mr. Shaw's Dictionary, we have TI *Mhor*, "The Supreme Being, God;" from which the Tartar term for an Illustrious personage, *Timour*, or TI=*Mour*, is derived. The AIR and AG in the formation of verbs have sometimes Pronouns put after them in such a manner, that we may consider them to be used in their sense as Prepositions. Do and Ro are sometimes likewise applied in the forming of verbs; and here again General Vallancey has well described them, when they perform this office, under the idea of "Verbal *Articles*." He tells us, moreover, that "As, which is called an Affirmative *Article*, is also no other than "the Spanish *Es*, and the Latin *Est*, and is a verb impersonal." Here it seems to be obscure, whether As should be considered, as a Particle of Affirmation, or an *Articular*—Demonstrative Pronoun, or a Verb, corresponding, as it might be in these three usages, with YES, IT, Is, respectively. I have myself expressed a doubt, whether YES, which means IT Is, should be considered as IT or Is. This, however, is an idle distinction, as it relates to the fundamental idea of the word.

The Galic SI=Os, SU=As, Up, Down, SHI=Os, SHU=As, Above and Below, AN=Ios, AN=UAS, Up, Down, with their parallel terms in other Dialects, are compounds. The Latin *S^=Us*, and the French J^=Us, in JUS=*Que*, belong to SU=As. In the same column of General Vallancey's Grammar, where *Su=As*, and *An=Uas*, 'Upward, Down,' are, I find SIU, 'Before, 'That, So, Here,' "SO, This, This here," where we have the simple form. In the Italian SU, we have likewise the simple form; and in SU=*Vi*, SU=^*L*, we have acknowledged compounds. We might hence conjecture, that the French *Su=^R*, Upon, is a compound; and to *Sur*, &c., signifying the Top,

we must refer, I think, terms denoting eminent personages, as *Sieur*, *Sir*, *Tzar*, &c.; and words signifying the 'Head—Top, or 'SUR=*face*,' as *Kara*, (Καρα, Caput,) &c. &c. This will open to us a wide sphere indeed for the process of composition. We shall now understand, that the French *Su*=^*S* and *Sou*=^*S* belong to *Su*=*As*. The French Etymologists refer *Sus* and *Sur* to the Latin *Sursum*, *Susum*; where we see, that in SU=*r*S we have the same composition as in SU=^*S*. The Etymologists derive *Sous* from *Sub*tus. Perhaps the *Su*=^*B* and *S*=*Uper* of the Latins are compounds. In Galic, *Ann*=*S*=*Ud*, and *Ann*=*So*, mean 'Here 'and There;' to which Celtic combinations the French *Ain*=*Si*, and its ancient form *Ain*=*S*^=*Ic*, directly belong. We have in Irish UIN=SI, which General Vallancey explains by "*Is*, *It is*."

The terms *Se*=*Ach*, *C*^=*Ach*, are enumerated among the Irish Particles by General Vallancey, as signifying "Rather than others, "else, otherwise;" to which, as we see, belongs the Latin *S*^=*Ec*=*Us*. The succeeding terms to *Se*=*Ach* in this collection of particles, are *Se*-*Acha*, *Se*=*Ach*=*Adh*, "By, aside, out of the "way," which signify '*That* Part or Way,' as distinguished from another. In the *Adh* of this latter word, we perhaps see the *Us* in the Latin *S*^=*Ec*=*Us*. I have supposed on a former occasion, that the Latin *S*=*Ic*, *S*^=*Ec*=*Us*, *C*^=*Is*, *S*^=*Us*, *S*^=*Ed*, &c. belong to each other; and we now see, how they are connected with these Celtic terms. The word *Se*=*Ach*=*Ad* occurs in the same column of General Vallancey's Grammar, in which "SO, This, "This here," is produced; and I find, likewise, in the same column, *Se*=*Adh*, "Yes, Yea, truly," to which we shall more directly refer the Latin *S*^=*Ed*. Robert Ainsworth explains SED *Autem*, SED *Enim*, by "*Yea* But,—But *Truly*," where we perceive how *Yea* and *Truly* are involved in the sense annexed to *But*. "Non solum interfuit, SED etiam præfuit,"—'Not only 'was he present at these things;—*Yes* indeed, *Yea*, *Truly*—

'Verily,

'Verily, &c. he presided over them.' Mr. Shaw, in his Galic and Irish Dictionary, produces the phrase "*Seadh, Seach,*" "By "turns, alternately;" which means, 'Now *This*, now *That.*' In the same column of Mr. Shaw's Dictionary, where SE=*Ach* occurs, we have SE, "He, It, Him." SE "For *Is e*, 'tis he, it;" where we have both the Verb and the Pronoun; and we see here another proof, how they are blended with each other. On considering the terms with which *Se=Ach* and *Se=Adh* appear to be connected, our ideas on the process of composition would be enlarged to an extent, which I shall not venture to unfold in the present state of these Discussions.

I have suggested on a former occasion, that most of the numerals from *One* to *Ten* are probably derived from Demonstrative parts of Speech. I have illustrated this idea in the terms *One—Two—Three.* The number *S^=Ix, S^=Ex,* &c. I conceive to be a compound, and to be derived from the same source. The simpler form I imagine to exist in the Irish SIA, which Mr. Shaw places in one article, as denoting *Six;* and in another, as signifying "Far off, the utmost, remotest from you." In the same column of his Dictionary, we have a word under the same form, which he explains by "Backwards, behind, the west, awry." The SIA is only another form of SUI, So, &c. produced above, denoting '*This—That* place;' and the SIA in this sense, must surely be the same as SIA—*This—That*—Such a number, SI=^*X.* In the same column where these words occur, we have likewise SI, She, Her, SI=*Ad*, They; where we have the genuine sense of a Pronominal part of Speech, SI=*Air*, Aside, SHI=*Air*, the West; where in the two latter words we have compounds, such as I have before unfolded. Thus then, the Latin SE=*X* does not come from *Ex*, (Εξ,) but it is a compound of SE=EX,—*Sia=Ex*, where the Ex means likewise *That.* Under another form, we have *Okto*, (Οκτω,) *Eight*, &c. &c. Thus then, EIS, (Εις,) EX, (Εξ,)

OKTO,

Okto, are different forms, applied to express different numbers, conveying the same fundamental idea. In the Italian Sei, we have either the simpler state, or the second Consonant is lost. In the Dialects of the Celtic, the name for Seven appears under the form S-T, S-C, &c., as *Saith, Seith, Sheaχd, Moir-Seisear,* as they are written by Lhuyd. In Mr. Shaw's Dictionary, the form of the Irish word is *Seach, Seacht,* Seven, which occurs in the same column, where we have *Seachad,* "By, aside, out of the way, "Past," which I have above produced as a compound denoting *This —That.* These words surely belong to each other. We cannot help observing, that the *T* exists in the Latin *Septem,* which may be quasi *Setem,* and in the Greek *Epta,* (Επτα,) which may be quasi *Eta.* We must not, however, forget to remark, that in Hebrew, Arabic, as in the Teutonic Dialects, the name for *Seven* appears under the Element SV, without any record of the T. In Gipsey and in Persian we have *Efta,* and *Haft,* denoting Seven, where we have the Greek form. In the Italian and Spanish *Sette* and *Siete,* we have the Celtic form; and the French *Sept* is quasi *Set,* without the sound of the *p.* In Persian, Do and Seh are *Two, Three;* where Do and Seh are plainly only different forms of each other, denoting *This—That.* Again, in Persian, Dah is *Ten,* which is either quasi *Dach,* as in the *Dec* of *Decem;* or it is the first portion of the compound De=*C.* In the Celtic Dialects, the name for this number appears under the form DC, &c., as *Deg, Dek, Deiχ,* the terms produced by Lhuyd under *Decem.* In the Teutonic, we have the form TN, as *Tyn,* (Sax.) *Ten,* (Eng.) *Zehen,* (Germ.) &c. &c. On this term, however, there are some difficulties.

As Sa in Irish signifies *That,* so it likewise means, as Mr. Shaw justly explains it, "In, In The;" where, in the interpretation The, we have the original idea. Under the same form Sa, Mr. Shaw has three different articles, in which it means

means *Self—Whose*—"And *His;*" where its genuine sense appears. Among the Celtic terms for *In*, Lhuyd produces the Irish *S^=An*, which belongs to *S^=In;* just as a part of these words SA means at once *That* and *In*. The English IN, with its parallel terms through so great a variety of Languages, belongs to the IN in *S^*=IN, and to the AN, *The, That*, in *S^*=AN. I find in Mr. Shaw's Dictionary, that SAN is placed in four separate articles, in which it is explained by "In THE," (*San's An*,)—"Holy," —"Put after Pronouns, and particularises the word to which it "is joined."—"*San Cann*. Thither and hither;" where C=ANN is only another form of S=AN, *This, That*. We cannot but refer the same form SAN, in the sense of "Holy," to the other meanings above produced; and thus we shall understand, that S=AN, '*Holy*,' signifies *The*, or *That* personage, by way of distinction. To SAN belongs SANCT*us*, with the parallel words in modern Languages, *Saint*, (Eng.) &c. &c.—SAN*us* should probably be considered as belonging to the Celtic SAN. General Vallancey, likewise, justly explains *San* by "In THE;" where, in the Demonstrative *The*, we see its primary sense. In the next column of General Vallancey's Grammar to that in which *San* is, I see its kindred terms SIN, *That, These*, SOIN, *That, Thence*. Here I see likewise other similar terms in a simple and in a compound state, as So, "This, This here;" So, "*This is;*" SIU, "So, "Here;" SUI, "Before, *That*," which I have produced above; SI=*Ar*, "Backwards, behind," just as BE=HIND means "*By*=YON," or *That* part. I see likewise, in the same opening of this Vocabulary, SCEO, "And," or, as it might be interpreted, 'So—in *That* 'Manner.' To the SCEO or CEO, as it is sometimes written, belongs the Greek KAI, (Καὶ.)

I shall here produce various Celtic terms attached to different Elements, under the Irish form, which I conceive to be derived from Demonstrative parts of Speech, denoting *This—That;*

That; and I shall duly mark those, which I conceive to be compounds:—*Ach*, *Achd*, But; *Atha*, Again; *Os*, Above; *Ag=Us*, *Ac=Us*, *Is*, *Eas*, And, belonging to the Latin Ac, Et, &c.; and *Cha*, Not; *Ca=It*, *Ca=Ide*, Where; *Ca=^T*, *C^=AD*, What; *Ca=Ode*, How; *Ca^=Ch*, All, every, (to which belong, as I before observed, the French *Chaque*, or *Cha^=Que*, the Spanish *Ca^=Da*, &c. &c.); *Ca=^N*, Whilst; *Ce=Ana*, Low, Behold; *Ca=^N*, Without, &c. &c.; *Co*, *Go*, With; *Ge*, *Ge Go*, Although; *Co=^R*, So that; *Da*, If; *De*, Whence; *Da=^R*, By; *Diu*, A long time since, (to which belongs the Latin *Diu*); *Do*, *Di*, — Diminutives, *An*, Very, Whether; *In*, Fit, &c. &c.; *Ma*, If; *Ma=^R*, As, Even as; *Ma=^S*, If; *Mo=^N*, *Mu=Na*, If not; *Fa*, Unto, Under; *Fa=^N*, Into; *Fe=In*, Self, &c. &c.; *Le*, *Le=Is*, *Le=In*, &c.

To the Celtic preposition *Le* belongs the Hebrew and Arabic Servile Letter *L*, when it is used as a Preposition Particle, if I may so express it. The Hebrew ל L, "To, Unto,—For, be-" cause of, on account of," &c. &c. &c.—" Redundant, or rather " abridged from אל" AL, "The," as Mr. Parkhurst explains it, is acknowledged to belong to אל AL, about which the Hebrew Scholars have been involved in so many difficulties, when they have attempted to discover its original idea. Mr. Parkhurst observes on the Hebrew אל AL, that "it is one of the most diffi-" cult Roots in the Hebrew Language; and various methods have " been taken by learned men to account for its several applica-" tions." He then adds, " After the most attentive consideration " I think the notion of *Interposition—Intervention*, or the like, bids " the fairest for the ideal meaning of it, and best reconciles its " different uses." Some of the senses produced by our Author, for this word, are *God*, the *Heavens*, *Leaders*,—*Assistance*, *Defense*, *Horned Animals*—*The*—*That*, as an " article or Pronoun," *To*, *Into*, &c., *No*, *Not*, &c. &c. We here unequivocally see, that the leading idea is *The*—*That*—*The* object—The *Eminent* or *Distinguished*

Distinguished object, as '*God*—Leaders,' &c. Powerful Creatures able to Assist, or to Attack, as *Defenders*, *Horned Animals*, &c. &c.

This Hebrew word אל AL belongs, as we shall agree, to the Latin ILLE, the Italian and French *Il*, the Spanish *El*, and the Arabic Article ال AL, &c. &c. As *Il*, and its parallels, have become *Le*, *Lo*, so has the Hebrew *AL*, 'To, into,' become L^, 'To, Into,' with the breathing after the L^. We perceive, moreover, a most unequivocal fact, which decides on the truth of my Hypothesis, namely, that the same word is at once the Pronominal part of Speech *The*, *That*, and the preposition *To*, which is the precise union of ideas, which I have conceived to take place on various occasion. I have supposed, that the explanatory terms here adopted by Mr. Parkhurst, THE and To, are examples of this union; and that they are only different forms of each other, with a similar meaning applied to different purposes. We perceive, moreover, what we shall find to be a very important fact on another occasion, that terms bearing a *Negative* sense may be derived from the Demonstrative part of Speech, under the idea of THE—object, as *Distinguished* for its *Bad* qualities—the *Vile* object—*Vile*—*Bad*—*No*, *Not*. The use of the Demonstrative part of Speech is acknowledged to be alike applicable to the Distinguished object—whether good or bad; and when we adopt such terms as THE—THAT, we all know, that by a different mode of applying them, as in scorn or abhorrence, THE! THAT! THE? THAT? we pass at once into expressions of aversion, which correspond with the application of Negative particles—*No*, *Not!* When the L is doubled in the Hebrew word, as אלל ALL, it is one of the strongest terms to express a *Vile* object; and Mr. Parkhurst accordingly explains it by "*Nought*, *Nothing*, Vain, *Nothing* "worth, Res nihili." It will not be necessary to examine the parallel terms in the Arabic, belonging to the Hebrew AL, and the particle *L^*, as they have a similar meaning. In Arabic,

ال

ال AL, is the Article, and *God*; and AL AL is "Deus optimus "maximus." In Arabic, ل L^ is a preposition *To*, as in Hebrew, Irish, &c.; and it means in general, "*That*, To, for, "because," &c., as Mr. Richardson explains it; where, in the conjunction *That*, we see the original idea. The succeeding word, in Mr. Richardson's Dictionary, is لا LA, "No, Not, Not at all." There is a curious combination of the various terms belonging to the Element ^L^, in the familiar Arabic sentence, لا اله الا الله LA, ALH, ALA, AL=^LH, "There is no God but God;" where the Element ^L^ is five times repeated, and in four it is applied to different purposes *Not*, *God*, *But*, *The*, though with the same radical meaning. In Arabic, the term *Ala*, الا not only means 'Except, Besides,' but it signifies the same as الى *Ali*, 'To, 'Until, &c., which is the full form of *Le*, ل. In the same Languages, هل HEL, means "Whether or Not.—Indeed, Aye. Yes.—"It is not," as Mr. Richardson explains it; where we see, that the word equally signifies *Yes* or *No*, only because it means *This* or *That*—*So*, &c. applied in a different manner.

It is curious to observe, how words, conveying the same Radical idea, though not directly connected with each other, express similar turns of meaning. I shall produce a word, belonging to this race, which appears to be a term, formed from nothing but the affectation or folly of the speaker. Language, however, exhibits no such terms; and among all the various mutations, which folly or affectation may controul, they have never been able to produce any change in the Elementary forms of Human Speech. Our term of affectation, LA, means simply *This*, *That*; and in some examples, we can hardly distinguish, whether it is applied in its Affirmative or Negative sense. Cressida says, "In Faith, I will, LA; never trust me else, (Act V. S. 2.) and Pandarus, in a former part of the play, says, "*Nay*, "that shall *not* serve your turn: that shall it *not*, in truth, LA.

"*Nay*,

" *Nay*, I care not for such words; *No, No.*" Though LA in both these places has the same meaning; yet in the former it is applied with the Affirmative idea; and in the latter, it is involved with the *Negative* sense. The French too, use *La La* for 'Indifferently,' or 'Somewhat badly;' and in Arabic, LA LA, ل ل is used to denote " Not at all,—By no means," &c.

These observations on terms implying *Negation*, will unfold to us the origin of a race of words, about which nothing is understood, and which are used in a *Negative* sense, through a wide compass of Human Speech. These words are No, (Eng.) NE, (Lat.) &c. &c.; and in a compound state, No=^*T*, (Eng.) NE=^*C*, No=^*N*, (Lat.) &c. &c. &c. The parallel terms to No, produced by the Etymologists, are *Na*, *No*, (Sax.) *Ne*, (Goth.) *Nei*, *Ne*, (Dan. Isl. Swed.) &c. &c. NOT is referred to the Belgic *Niet*, the German *Nicht*, *Nocht*, (Scotch,) &c. &c. In the Dialects of the Celtic, we find in Lhuyd, under *Non*, the following terms: "*Na*, *Nag*, *Ni*, *Nid*, *Nis*, *Heni*, Dem. No, Not, *Na*, *Ne*, " *Nag*, *Nag* yu, quod non est. Ar. *Ne*, Ir. *Ni*, Ko, *Naide*. " K. *Nim*, *Nior*, *Nar*, *Naχ*, *Na*, Gion, *Naχa*, *Konaχ*. Non est, " *Ni* v'uil, *Nil*." All these words belonging to the Element N^, as No, NE, NI, &c., originally, I imagine, denoted *This* or *That* Being; and in their compound state, No=*T*, NE=^*C*, NA=^*G*, NI=^*M*, &c., they still conveyed the same idea. We have seen, that the Celtic article AN becomes in the plural NA, with the breathing after the N^; and in N^=AN, the genitive Plural, we have a similar combination, though applied in a different sense, to that of the Negative No=^N. We have seen in Arabic, that the Negative particle *Le*, belonging to the Article *Al*, has the breathing after the L^.

The Etymologists, under the Latin NE, remind us of the Greek NE, NEE, (Nε, Nη,) and the Hebrew עַ AIN; and they have referred us moreover to the Greek EEN, AN, (Hν, Aν,) and the

Latin An. In Ne, the interrogation, we have precisely the sense of An, which simply denotes *That* in an interrogative sense; just as *Quid*, That thing, *Ali=Quid*, becomes the interrogative *Quid*, What? In the Greek Nee, (Νη, Particula affirmantis et jurantis, Νη Δια, per Jovem, profecto, Gl. V. Νη Δια, Etiam, in comp. priv. interdum etiam intendit et auget, ut Νηχυτος, &c.), we unequivocally see the genuine idea; since it is used in the *Affirmative* sense as well as the *Negative*. In the explanatory word Et*iam*, which belongs to Et, Id, and means 'In *This* or 'That same manner, *So*,' we see likewise the true notion. The Greek Nai, (Ναι, Næ, Ita, Etiam, Sane, Utique,) and the Latin Næ, contain likewise the original idea. The explanatory word Ita is acknowledged to belong to Id. The Celtic Cho, *Not*, belongs to the Element C^, *That*. Cho means at once, "Not, Whose," where it is both a Negative particle and a Pronoun; and the adjacent terms in Mr. Shaw's Dictionary are "Co, As," and "Co, Who? "Which," divided by this Lexicographer into separate articles. The Greek *Ou*, (Ου, Non,) the Negative, belongs to the *Ou*, (Οὐ,) the Pronoun, and in the *Ouk*, *Ouch*, (Ουκ, Ουχ,) the *K* and *Ch*, κ, χ, might have been originally added before vowels, as it is commonly supposed; yet they might be distinct words belonging to the Element ^C. We have *Ouki* and *Ouchi*, (Ουκι, Ουχι,) and we know, that *Ouk*, (Ουκ,) is often placed at the end of a period, by way of a strong mode of Negation, Ου μοι δοκει, ω Ιππια· ΟΥΚ, 'Non mihi videtur, O Hippia. *Nequaquam*.'

The particle Mee, (Μη, Ne, Non, Nunquid? An?) belongs to the Element M^, under the idea of the Pronominal part of Speech. We perceive the interpretation *An*, and the Pronominal term *Numquid;* where let us mark N^=Um, which is a compound of the Elements N^ and M^, bearing the same meaning. We have seen under a similar form the Celtic *Nim*, Not. Let us mark the parallel term to *Mee*, (Μη.)—The Greek Ma, (Μα,

Jurandi

Jurandi negativum, Μα Δια, Non certe per Jovem, ου μα Δια, idem. Sed Ναι μα Δια, affirm. profecto, certe, per Jovem. Occurrit Μα solum et affirmative, sed raro, et fere apud recentiores,) which is used in an affirmative as well as in a negative sense; and these senses belong to each other, just as *Nee* belongs to *Nai*, (Νη, Ναι.) The Greek MA, (Μα,) must be referred to the Hebrew מה MH, 'Who, Which, What;' and this is directly attached to the Hebrew אם AM, which denotes a Mother; and which is moreover used as an *Affirmative—Interrogative* and *Negative* Particle.—We have seen, that the Enclitic NE has been compared with the Hebrew AIN אין Not; and the original idea annexed to this word will be seen in its parallel Arabic term ان AN, which Mr. Richardson explains by "1. *That*, in order to. 2. If. 3. Behold. 4. *Not*, "(particularly after an oath,)" &c.&c., which again unequivocally decides on the truth of my Hypothesis. These Hebrew and Arabic terms AIN, AN, belong to the Pronouns הן هن HN, They. This union of ideas of *That* and *If*, in the Arabic ان AN, will shew us, that the English AN, in the sense of *If*, ("AN it like "you,") belongs to AN, the Article. The Greek EAN, EEN, AN, INA, (Εαν, Ην, Αν, Ινα,) belong to EN, (Εν, Unum,) for the same reason; and we see how these terms, with the Latin AN, &c. &c., are all ultimately to be referred to each other. I do not attempt to adjust the precise degrees of affinity, which exist between them. I have shewn on former occasions, that the Latin SI has the same meaning as the English So—denoting *This* or *That;* as SI Placet—'SO it pleases you, If SO be, it pleases you;' and to this we shall all agree. In the Irish and Galic Dialects of the Celtic, AIN is a Negative Particle, compounded with an adjective; and we shall now recollect, that in English AN or UN has a similar meaning, and for the same reason.

The Irish NA General Vallancey explains by "Nor, Neither, "Not, Or, Than." Let us first mark, that NA signifies *Than*.

We

We have seen, that the idea conveyed by *Than* has been often expressed by a Pronominal part of Speech, as in the term itself—*Than*, which I have referred to *Then*, signifying *That* time,—H, (H, Quam,) in Greek, belonging to the Pronoun, under the same form; and likewise in *Che* and *Que*, (Ital. and Fr.) We see, moreover, that this sense of NA, *Than*, is involved with that of NOR; and let us remember, that in vulgar English, NOR is used as a term of comparison, 'He is greater NOR he.' We perceive, that this phrase, through a vulgarism, is derived from a just impression on the force of words.—In Scotch, NOR is used for *Than;* and so likewise is the simple state NA. I find in the same column of General Vallancey's Grammar, where NA occurs, *Nach*, 'Whether or No, is Not, almost,' '*Naide*, Who, Which,' '*Noch*, Which.' These terms exhibit, in fact, the same compositions as *Not*, with a different turn of meaning. The *Noch* coincides with the German *Noch;* and when in this Language we find the union *Noch Nicht*, we have terms belonging to each other, applied to different purposes. The term *D^-Och* is a compound of D^=^C. The Etymologists are aware, in some cases, how the Negative Particles NE, No, are combined with other words, as *Nam*, for *Ne Am*, *Nat* and *Not*, which they consider to be *Ne What*, *Ne Wot*, *Nist*, *Ne wist*, *Nold*, *Ne Would*. The *Nold* is precisely the same combination as *Nolo*, from *Ne* and *Volo;* or as *Nill* in the phrase *Willy Nilly*; and in *Malo* we have the intensive M^, *Ma*, and *Volo*. In Gothic, *Nist* is for *Ni Ist*, *Is Not;* and in Persian we have precisely the same combination. The Greek N^=EK*us*, (Νεκυς, Mortuus,) is a similar composition, and means the N^=IST, the N^=OT, the person who *Is* N^=OT, or No more. We shall hence understand, that Now, N^=ONCE, (Eng.) N^=UNC, N^=UN, (Νυν,) all belong to each other; and that they signify 'At, &c. *This*—time,—on *This* Occasion,' &c. N^=OON is not the *Nona* hora, but 'THE—Time,' by way of eminence. I shall not

not proceed to any greater length at present with my illustration of the Element ^N^, which will afford me an ample subject of future discussion. These observations are sufficient to shew us, how widely the same idea operates in forming words under different Elements, and how similar principles exert their influence through the whole compass of Human Speech.

Wherever we turn our eyes in contemplating the mechanism of Language; we view on all sides the same strong and striking proofs of order—uniformity and consistency. It is indeed a marvellous art, in which the artist is unconscious of his skill, and totally ignorant of that exquisite and unerring contrivance, by which his machinery has been conceived—conducted and compleated. Still, however, all his principles are just, and all his exertions are directed to the same purpose, and terminate in the same end. The great work of Language is at last accomplished; and Man communicates with Man, in a curious system of artifice and of order, which exhibits the abundance of its resources, under an infinite variety of forms, and with unbounded diversity of effect *.

---

* This article on the *Celtic* Pronouns and Particles should be well studied by those, who are desirous of investigating the affinities of Human Speech, and especially in such Languages, which we have been accustomed to consider as Barbarous. We must found our researches on the *Celtic Dialects*, and we must apply to *Pronouns* and *Particles*, as the most certain objects for tracing that affinity, which we are endeavouring to discover. Other words may be so much transformed in appearance and in sense, as to be removed out of the reach of all but those, who are consummate adepts in the secrets of Language. But *Pronouns* and *Particles* proceed only to a certain point in composition, and still remain in their more simple and original form. The Numerals, which have been commonly produced as the most certain marks of affinity, are the most changeable—uncertain and fallacious. The long words, which Barbarous Languages are represented as possessing, have arisen probably alike from the ignorance of those, who have detailed their own Language, and of those who have recorded it. A sentence has been mistaken for a word, and a description of properties and qualities for a name. The length of words by composition, &c. has been effected in

in Barbarous Languages by a similar process to that, which has taken place in other Languages; though perhaps it has not proceeded to a greater or even to so great an extent as in those Languages, with which we are most acquainted, where the artifice of composition, by Prepositions and inflexions in Nouns and Verbs, has been adopted. In the *Mohawk Language*, which is supposed to be the most Barbarous of Languages, the Celtic Scholar will immediately discover its connexion with the Celtic Dialects, and especially by observing the Particles and Pronouns. The familiar Preposition in this Language, Tsin, *In, At,* &c., will at once direct him to the Celtic San. In the same Language Ok is *But,* Ne is *She, A, Who,* &c. Neoni, *And;* where we see the force of the Element N^. Mr. Shaw explains "Nae, Nai, Nui, A Man, Woman;" and General Vallancey inserts, among Irish particles, Neo, *And.* In the Mohawk Language Neog is God, which brings us to the Irish Neoch, Good, which means only *The—That,* Distinguished object. The next word in Mr. Shaw's Dictionary is Neoid, "Bad, *Naught;*" where we have a similar idea, applied to a different purpose. General Vallancey produces Nog*en*, as the Kalmuc word for "A Lord, Master," which he compares with the Irish Nodh, Nogh, Noble. In Mohawk, Kayan*er*, Sayan*er*, signify *Lord, King,* which belong to the explanatory word King, and its parallels in the Teutonic Dialects, to the Celtic San, *That,* Cyn, the First, and to a great race of words to be found through the whole compass of Language. Even the long words, which appear so formidable in this Language, will on many occasions afford the Celtic Scholar but little trouble; and he will be able to perform the part of an Etymologist without any violent effort of skill. Thus in the term for *Heaven,* Karonghyagouh, he will unequivocally see in Karon the familiar name for the Sun in the Celtic Dialects Grian, which the Greeks and Latins have adopted in their Carn*ean* and Gryn*æan* Apollo.

Σπαρτη τοι, KAPNEIE, τοδε πρωτιστον εδιθλον. (*Call. in Apoll.* v. 72.)

"His tibi Grynæi nemoris dicatur origo,
"Ne quis sit lucus, quo se plus jactet *Apollo.*" (*Virg. Ecl.* VI. v. 72-3.)

On this origin of Karon we shall have no doubt; and perhaps the Celtic Scholar would conjecture, that Ghyagouh belongs to the Irish Gogor, Light, to which our term Gorg*eous* belongs. Thus Karon Ghyagough means the Place where 'The '*Light* of the *Sun*' appears.

The Reader may perhaps smile at a Greek and Latin quotation for the purpose of confirming a *Mohawk* Etymology; but his surprise may be diminished, when he has learned, what the most learned and acute—I had almost said, of all my predecessors in the study of Languages, has observed on the savage Dialects of America. The Jesuit *Lafitau,* who lived among these American Savages, has conjectured, that some of these tribes were Grecian Colonies; and I have little doubt, that a Grecian Dialect is at this moment somewhere spoken in the wilds of America.—Others have conjectured, that among some of those Tribes a Celtic Dialect prevails. My Lord Monboddo was himself acquainted with a Jesuit, who understood the *Basque,* Celtic Dialect,

Dialect, spoken at the foot of the Pyrenees, by his knowledge of the *Esquimaux* Language. Even the evidence of Lord Monboddo may be produced in a Philological discussion for the confirmation of an Historical fact. General Vallancey has faintly conjectured, with a quære, though with perfect truth and admirable acuteness, that the name of KAMSCHATKA belongs to the Irish CAMCACTA, or CAMCEACHTA, as Mr. Shaw represents it, "The seven stars, which roll about the North Pole," or the "North Pole." (*Essay on Celtic Language*, p. 90.) The MOHAWKS, a tribe of the Iroquois nation, belong to some clan of the MACS. From the *Iroquois*, we could not perhaps form a conjecture; but it must be owned, after the observations just made, that the CHEROKEES look marvellously like the GREEKS; and I must own, that I am inclined to attribute to this nation the honours of the GREEK Name. The MACEDON-ians are, I imagine, the MACDONS, as in MACDON-*ald*; and the MUR=MIDONS, (Μυρμιδονες,) are the MOR-MACDONS, the *Great* MACDONS. The *Mur* is the Celtic MOR, "Great, noble, bulky, many," as Mr. Shaw explains the Irish term. The term MAC has been acknowledged to appear in the name of Nations, as in KAL=MUC, which General Vallancey conjectures in one place to be *Ceil* or *Keilt* MIC or MAC, "the Sons "or Descendants of the *Chals* or *Kelts*," i. e. the CELTS, (*Essay on C. Lang.* p. 92.) Though General Vallancey has seen, that the *Kalmucks* and *Mongals* or *Moguls* belong to each other, he does not appear to have understood, that they exhibit the same compound in a contrary order, KAL=MAC and MAC=KAL, or MOG=GUL. In the same page, where General Vallancey has produced the derivation of *Kalmuc*, he has resolved *M'Intosh* into *Mac=an=Taois*, "the son of a General, Prince, or Chief." Through the whole compass of Language, $\overline{\text{DS}}$-N, $\overline{\text{DC}}$-N, ZN, C-N, D-N, mean '*The* 'Illustrious Personage—the First—Chief—Man,' &c. &c. In the succeeding page, this enquiring Linguist has produced the Kalmuck term KONTAYSHA, a Chief, which he has justly referred to the Irish CEAN-TAOISI. The CEAN belongs to *King—Cyn*, which I have just produced. The province KEN=TUCKY, with which the *Mohawks* or MACS are connected, is compounded of the same materials, and so is our familiar name KEN=TISH. General Vallancey will rejoice, I trust, to have his Celtic origin of KAMSCHATKA confirmed, by learning, that SIBERIA itself is the region inhabited by the great Celtic Tribe, the illustrious race of the CYMRI—CIMBRI, CAMBRI-*ans*, &c. &c.; and it is from the region of SIBERIA that the Ancients have obtained their CIMMERIANS, living in darkness. The *Scythian* or Tartar tribe of the *Kalmucs* is allowed, we see, to be a *Celtic* tribe, speaking Celtic Dialects; but it has not been seen, that the SCYTHÆ, and its acknowledged parallel terms, *Scots*, *Goths*, the *Coti*, &c. &c., are quasi the SCYLTHÆ, the CELTS, &c. The sound of the *l* has been lost, as it perpetually is in our own and other Languages, as in *Talk*, *Walk*, *Soldier*, &c., pronounced sometimes as *Tauk*, *Wauk*, *Sodier*, &c. It is actually lost in another name of the CELTIC tribes, the CHALDÆANS, whom the Hebrews represent by '*Chasd*-im.' My conjecture, however, about the origin of *Scythæ* will be placed beyond doubt, when the Reader learns, what Herodotus informs us, that the ancient name of the *Scythæ* was SCOLOTI, which, we see, are the CELTS. Wherever we turn our eyes among the nations of the Earth, we find all around us to

be

be *Celtic*. Thus we see, that the dispute about a *Gothic* or a *Celtic* origin is idle, and almost unmeaning, as they are ultimately to be considered, as belonging to each other, though under one point of view the Dialects, which we denominate *Celtic* and *Gothic*, will afford us a just and proper ground of distinction. I shall not venture to pursue this ample theme, which would lead us into a new world of ideas, totally unknown and unexplored; yet I could not forbear to seize on certain occasions, which presented themselves before me, for the purpose of exciting the Celtic Scholar to the consideration of so ample a theme, and of rousing him from a slumber, which, as I have before observed, has been so long and so profound.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

MAR 2 5 1959
REC'D LD-URB
LD URL MAY 21 1973
JUN 6 1973

Form L9–40*m*-7,'56(C790s4)444

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
D 000 592 569 8

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
THIS BOOK CARD

THE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LOS ANGELES

University Research Library

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54
IBM J95993

P 321 W62

CALL NUMBER
SER
VOL 1
PT
COP

AUTHOR